OBSERVATIONS

ON

SEVERAL PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF

PROVERBS;

WITH

TWO SERMONS:

BY

THOMAS HUNT, D.D. F.R.&A.SS.

LATE CANON OF CHRIST-CHURCH,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW,

AND LAUDIAN PROFESSOR OF ARABIC.

OXFORD,

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS:

SOLD BY D. PRINCE; AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

M DCC LXX V.

CMC
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM

PREFACE.

THERE can be no occaſion for recommending to the Learned, or at leaſt to the Friends of Religion and Lovers of Sacred Criticiſm, any of the Compoſitions of the late celebrated Profeſſor, Dr THOMAS HUNT. But, in proportion to the Greatneſs of his literary Fame, and the high Eſtimation in which he was juſtly held by real Proficients in Oriental Literature, ſhould be the Care to ſatisfy the World, that any *Poſthumous* Works, bearing his Name, came in fact from his own Pen, and were intended by Him for Publication.

IN conſequence of the particular Friendſhip, with which this learned Profeſſor honoured me, during near Thirty Years, I became fully acquainted with the ſeveral Obſervations, which he was at laſt prevailed upon to commit to the Preſs. And it is well known, that 112 Pages of this Book were printed off, long before his Death. Should it be aſked, as perhaps it may, Why he himſelf did not finiſh it? The beſt, and I believe the only true anſwer, is—that he was remarkably timorous, and diſtruſtful of his own Judgment; and that, in his declining Years, he grew more and more fearful of the Severity of Public Criticiſm. And yet, as he

continued

continued uniform, in declaring it his Intention to compleat this Volume; and had acquainted me with every part, of which he meant it ſhould conſiſt: I think it my Duty, out of Gratitude and Reſpect to his Memory, to finiſh the Volume; and to offer, for him, a very acceptable Preſent to the Public.

I MUST here aſſure the Reader, that *The Introduction* is now exactly the ſame, as the Profeſſor himſelf ſtated it; and that *what follows page* 112, is alſo publiſhed faithfully from his own Papers; as well as *The Sermon at the End*: which laſt (after he had written the Introduction, which ſpeaks but of *one* Sermon) he determined to add, at the earneſt Requeſt of ſome very valuable Friends.

THE Whole therefore of this Volume is the genuine Work of the ſame Author; and by him equally intended for the Preſs. And the only Difference between what was printed off *before*, and *ſince*, the Profeſſor's Death, is this—that the former was probably executed with greater Exactneſs by himſelf, at his leiſure, than the latter has been by me, fully employed as I am in a Publication of my own. Where Authors are not themſelves the Editors of their own Works; they cannot ſuppoſe, either that equal Care will be manifeſted by any caſual Editor, or that equal Deference will be paid to what is *Poſthumous* by the learned Readers.

HAVING

PREFACE.

HAVING thus mentioned the known Delay, and paſt Interruption, of the following Work; and of courſe the poſſibility of it's having been loſt to the World, on account of the Author's Death; being alſo convinced, that there is an indiſpenſable Obligation, incumbent on every Man, *to do every thing poſſible*—and *as ſoon as poſſible*—for THE PUBLIC GOOD; I beg leave to conclude this ſhort Preface, with recommending to the frequent Recollection of Others that ſolemn Exhortation, of which I have not (I hope) lived unmindful myſelf: WHATSOEVER THY HAND FINDETH TO DO, DO IT WITH THY MIGHT; FOR THERE IS NO WORK, NOR DEVICE, NOR KNOWLEDGE, NOR WISDOM, IN THE GRAVE, WHITHER THOU GOEST.

CHRIST-CHURCH;
MARCH 3, 1775.

BENJ. KENNICOTT.

EXTRACT

OF

A LETTER to Dr HUNT

from

Dr TAYLOR, Author of *The Hebrew Concordance:*

Dated *Norwich*, April 5, 1757.

—— *I never met with any Criticiſm, that pleaſed me better than Your's upon* Proverbs VII, 22. *It reſtores the Text, otherwiſe miſerably confuſed, to ſo proper and elegant a Senſe, with ſo much Eaſe and Probability, that it muſt gain the Aſſent of every impartial Judge. And great pity it is, that any thing, done by ſo maſterly a Pen, ſhould be loſt. Dr Hunt, I am ſure, will ſend nothing into the World, that is ſuperficial or futil; and therefore I do earneſtly requeſt, that You would be ſo good, as to reviſe and publiſh what You have by You.*

I am, &c.

J. TAYLOR.

Some Errata.

Page	22,	line	5 :	read ——	*to the toils*
——	25	——	28 :	read ——	*ouverts*
——	56	——	4 :	read ——	כנף :
——	79	——	15 :	read ——	لسعة,
——	90	——	ult. :	read ——	too cruel,
——	116	——	16 :	read ——	מעלין
——	127	——	14 :	read ——	*threfh*
——	133	——	15 :	read ——	מוסר
——	139	——	4 :	read ——	ואחריתו

INTRODUCTION

BY

THE AUTHOR.

AS a New Edition of the *Diſſertation*, which I publiſhed many years ſince, on a Text in the Book of *Proverbs*, has long been deſired; I have at laſt conſented to re-publiſh it, and have made in it ſome few Alterations. And I have been the more eaſily induced to give this Second Edition of it, becauſe I have been prevailed upon by my Friends to make public a *Sermon*, which I lately had the honour to preach before our Univerſity, on another Text in the Book of *Proverbs* likewiſe. To this Diſſertation, and Sermon, I have added ſome critical Remarks on other difficult paſſages in the ſame ſacred Book; which I have called *Obſervations*, rather than Diſſertations; on account of the ſhortneſs of the greater part of them: and all theſe, together with the Diſſertation and Sermon, I here ſubmit to the *Judgment*, hoping that I ſubmit them at the ſame time to the *Candour*, of the learned Reader.

AMONG all the Books of holy Scripture, there are few, if any, which contain at preſent more and greater Obſcurities, than this Book of the *Proverbs*. And of courſe this Book ſhould engage the ſtudious attention

of thoſe, who can at all illuſtrate it; either by general Obſervations on the peculiar nature of ſuch a Collection, or by Remarks on any particular Parts of it.

IT has been well obſerved by the Critics, that there is no better way, in general, to come at the true Meaning of an Author, than *to compare him with himſelf*. This obſervation is founded on a ſuppoſition, that every Author has his peculiar Method of expreſſing himſelf, and that he every where acts conſiſtently with it: the former is true of every Writer, in general, and the latter of every good one. Men's *Styles* are almoſt as different as their *Faces*. And as in the latter, there are ſome peculiar Lines and Features, which make up The Perſon, and diſtinguiſh him from every other; ſo are there, in the former, certain Modes of Thinking, and Turns of Expreſſion, which diſcover their Author, and point out the pen from which they flow.

WHOEVER therefore ſits down to any Book, with a deſign of reading it with profit to himſelf, or of explaining it with ſucceſs to another, muſt be particularly careful to enter into the Spirit and Genius of the writer; to acquaint himſelf with his Manner; to ſtudy his Diction; and weigh his Sentiments: and thereby, at laſt, to inſinuate himſelf into a thorough Intimacy and Acquaintance with him. The effect of this Familiarity with your Author will be, that he will open himſelf freely to you; lay out his whole Mind before you; and not ſuffer you to go away with any Difficulty, which your long Friendſhip with him has entitled you to a Solution of.

THIS

THIS is a method, which has always been found of great uſe for underſtanding *Profane* Authors; and it will equally hold in our ſtudy of the *Sacred*. *They* too, it is certain, are the beſt Expoſitors of Themſelves; and will be moſt eaſily underſtood by thoſe, who compare them moſt carefully. They likewiſe have their peculiar and diſtinguiſhing ways of expreſſing themſelves; by duly attending to which, and ſo in this ſenſe *comparing ſpiritual things with ſpiritual*, the careful Expoſitor will in time contract ſuch an Acquaintance with them, as will enable him clearly to diſcern their meaning, upon moſt occaſions; and readily to account for Difficulties in places of Obſcurity, by having obſerved their ſeveral Methods in places leſs dark and intricate.

As this is true of the whole Bible, in general; ſo, in a particular manner, of the Book of *Proverbs*. Theſe Proverbs, being for the moſt part looſe and independent ſentences, are not capable of receiving that help from *the Context*, which many other paſſages of Scripture are: conſequently our way of ſtudying *Theſe* cannot be the ſame with that we make uſe of for underſtanding *Thoſe*. But then, this Book has a Method of its own; and ſuch a one too, as, if duly regarded, will ſerve for a clue to conduct us through the intricacies of moſt of theſe *dark ſayings*; and to bring us to *the knowledge of a Proverb, and the Interpretation thereof*. If the *Proverbs* have not that advantage from the Context, which the more connected parts of Scripture have; they can do without it. Each of them, if rightly divided and conſidered,

ſidered, is a Comment on itſelf; and the very obſcureſt, when ſet in a proper view, will ſhine by its own luſtre.

For the clearer underſtanding of what is here advanced; we are to take notice, that almoſt all theſe antient Aphoriſms are (like moſt of the Proverbs uſed in the Eaſt at this day) divided into Two Parts, or verſicles, or (as the Greeks call them) *Hemiſtichs*; which, to make the diviſion the more conſpicuous, are, in Grabe's Edition of the Alexandrian MS of the LXX, accordingly ranged under each other; both beginning with capital letters. Theſe two Hemiſtichs are generally connected together by the Hebrew particle *Vau*; which, in our language, is rendered by *And*, or *But*, according as the ſubject-matter of the Proverb will admit. If the ſubject-matter of both parts be the *ſame*; it is rendered *And*, and denotes the Agreement there is between them: if *different*, it is rendered *But*, and denotes the Diſagreement. In the one caſe, the latter Hemiſtich is put by way of Repetition and Confirmation of the former; in the other caſe, by way of Antitheſis and Oppoſition to it. Among many other examples of the *former* kind, we may inſtance in the following verſes of the third chapter.

13. Happy is the man, that findeth wiſdom;
And the man, that getteth underſtanding.

14. For the merchandiſe of it is better than the merchandiſe of [ſilver;
And the gain thereof than fine gold.

15. She is more precious than rubies;
And all the things thou canſt deſire are not to be compared unto her.

16. Length

16. Length of days is in her right hand;
*(And *)* in her left hand riches and honour.
17. Her ways are ways of pleaſantneſs;
And all her paths are peace.

OF the *latter* kind, the following verſes, in chapter X, may be examples.

1. A wiſe ſon maketh a glad father;
But a fooliſh ſon is the heavineſs of his mother.
2. Treaſures of wickedneſs profit nothing;
But righteouſneſs delivereth from death.
3. The Lord will not ſuffer the ſoul of the righteous to famiſh;
But he caſteth away the ſubſtance of the wicked.
6. Bleſſings are upon the head of the juſt;
But violence covereth the mouth of the wicked.
7. The memory of the juſt is bleſſed;
But the name of the wicked ſhall rot.

IN both theſe caſes, that is, whether one hemiſtich be put by way of Confirmation of the other, or by

* In this beautiful deſcription, the moſt ſtriking verſe of the whole, which is the 16th, muſt have been here omitted, as not being to my preſent purpoſe; had there not been ſufficient authority for prefixing to this ſecond hemiſtich the Conjunction, which is ſupplied *in Italics* in our Engliſh Bible. But, though this particle of connection, which is expreſſed in the verſes before and after, is not found here in our printed Hebrew Text; yet I am informed by my friend *Dr Kennicott*, that this very particle is now extant, at the head of this hemiſtich, in at leaſt TEN MSS. And, that the writers of theſe MSS have not here confederated to inſert a ſpurious Letter, is clear from hence; that this ſame Letter is expreſſed *here* in all the antient Verſions, and alſo the Chaldee Paraphraſe. This indeed is not a correction of great conſequence to the Senſe. And yet, it is ſo happy a recovery of a Particle, which every Reader of Taſte muſt ſee to be here neceſſary; that it is with great pleaſure I mention here, for the firſt time, the Advantage which the World may expect from *The Collation of the Hebrew Manuſcripts*.

way

way of Oppoſition to it; they mutually explain each other: and when we underſtand one, as we generally may, it is not often difficult to underſtand the other. Wherefore, as this is the almoſt invariable Method of theſe Sentences; it will follow, that wherever a Tranſlation appears to depart from this Method, that is, wherever the hemiſtichs are ſo rendered as not to expreſs this Dependance on each other; we have great reaſon to ſuſpect either the *Truth* of *ſuch Tranſlation*, or the *Purity* of the *preſent Text*.

HAVING premiſed thus much, concerning the general Nature of theſe *Proverbs*, I ſhall now conclude this Introduction. And I apprehend that I cannot do it more uſefully, and therefore more properly, than with a few very pertinent extracts from a Book, which cannot be too highly recommended to all the Students in Hebrew Literature: perhaps, I need not tell the Reader, that I mean the juſtly-celebrated *Lectures* on *the Sacred Hebrew Poetry*, by the preſent Right Reverend and Very Learned *Lord Biſhop of* OXFORD.

PRÆLECT. III. *Habet Hebræorum Poeſis peculiarem quandam, ſibique accommodatam, ſententiarum conformationem; cujus ea ratio eſt, ut plena comprehenſio in ſuas partes fere æqualiter diſtribuatur, atque integra ejus membra integros verſus conficiant. Itaque ut poemata in* Periodos *plerumque æquales, quaſi ſua ſponte ſe diſpertiunt, ita periodi ipſæ per ſe dividuntur in ſuos* Verſiculos.—*Hebræi vates idem ſæpius diverſis verbis exprimunt, aut diverſa eâdem verborum forma includunt;*

cum

cum paria paribus referuntur, adverſis opponuntur contraria.

PRÆLECT. IV. *Carmen Hebræis vocatur* מומר, *hoc eſt, oratio brevis, conciſa, certis membrorum intervallis et cæſuris demenſa: ea Verſus et Numerorum propria eſt appellatio. Idem, ratione Dictionis et Senſuum,* משל *dicitur; quod ipſum eſſe arbitror Styli Poetici vocabulum.* Parabolam *vocant plerique interpretes; verbo aliqua ex parte non incommodo, ſed quod totum Hebrææ vocis ambitum minimè complectitur; cujus ſi vim atque uſum inveſtigemus, eâ inveniemus Tria potiſſimum ſignificari;* Sententioſum, Figuratum, *et* Sublime *dicendi genus.— Ea maxima ſemper ſcientiæ atque eruditionis laus habebatur, verſari in dictis prudentium,* Veterum Parabolas *atque Ænigmata callere. Quorum nominum utrovis æque notare videntur duo Carminum genera; quæ, quanquam ex aliqua parte multum inter ſe diſtarent, aliqua tamen haberent communia. Alterum voco* DIDACTICUM, *verſibus eleganter et acute concinnatis Præcepta includens; et Comparationibus, ſive apertis ſive occultis, ſæpe illuſtratum; quales erant* Sapientium Γνωμαι *atque* Adagia: *alterum erat vere* Poeticum, *omnibus grandioris ſtyli coloribus ornatum — Erat utrumque breve plerumque et ſubobſcurum; utrumque ſemper numeroſis conſtabat ſententiis: quam præcipue ob cauſam videntur dictionem* Poeticam, *et* PROVERBIALEM SIVE DIDACTICAM, *uno atque eodem nomine deſignâſſe.*

PRÆLECT. XXIV. *Qui ingenio et prudentia longoque rerum uſu præſtabant, ii ſuæ ſcientiæ ſummam omnem, quaſi in compendium adductam, per* Axiomata *quædam*

ac

ac Præcepta *in aliorum utilitatem vulgabant; ea efficaciora et apud rudes homines plus ponderis habitura, quod non disputarent, sed juberent; non suaderent, sed cogerent; non per argumentorum anfractus circumducerent, sed recta impellerent, ad bene et honeste sentiendum agendumque. Eadem tamen ne nimia severitate averterent audientium animos, sed ut allicerent potius et ad se invitarent, aliquo ornatus lenocinio opus erat: itaque effata sua in breves, acutas, et numerosas sententias includebant; figuris, imaginibus, et comparationibus illustratas, multisque rerum et verborum luminibus distinctas. Apud plerosque populos primitus saltem obtinuit hæc ratio; apud Hebræos semper viguit. Ii hoc genus sententiarum* מָשָׁל *vocabant; tum quod sæpe constarent* Parabolis *propriè dictis; tum quod vi quadam atque auctoritate semper pollerent, et in audientium animis quodammodo* dominarentur. *Ex hoc genere* didactico *multa superfunt Hebrææ Poseos monumenta; in quibus principem locum facile obtinent* Parabolæ Salomonis.

A DIS-

A

DISSERTATION

ON

PROVERBS VII; 22, 23.

Being a SPECIMEN of

CRITICAL DISSERTATIONS

ON THE

PROVERBS OF *SOLOMON:*

Addreſſed to the Students in *Arabic*, and the other *Oriental* Languages, in the UNIVERSITY of *OXFORD.*

THE SECOND EDITION,

CORRECTED.

TO THE

STUDENTS IN ARABIC,

AND THE OTHER

ORIENTAL LANGUAGES,

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF *OXFORD.*

GENTLEMEN,

YOU may remember, that in our reading the *Old Teſtament* together, I have, among the other directions I have given you for your right underſtanding the *Original* Language of it, often recommended to you one thing, which I take to be in the higheſt degree conducive to that uſeful end; and that is, your making yourſelves competent maſters of the neighbouring Dialects, the *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, *Æthiopic*, and above all the *Arabic*.

BY this advice, when applied to the *laſt* of theſe languages, I do not mean your acquiring ſuch a knowledge of it, as will enable you to read the great variety of books, that have been written in it, readily and currently; much leſs, to write and ſpeak it correctly and fluently. For this is a degree of proficiency, that will

require more time, perhaps, than you can well ſpare from your other ſtudies; and is ſcarcely to be attained by the cloſeſt application, where there is not a particular genius for that part of learning. The *Arabic* is a moſt copious and extenſive language. It has ſometimes (and, I think, not improperly) been compared to a vaſt *Ocean*; in reſpect of which the *Hebrew* (that is, the ſmall remains we *now* have of the *Hebrew*) and all the ſeveral *Dialects* ſprung from it, are but as ſo many rivulets, or ſmall ſtreams, which have, for a long ſucceſſion of ages, been continually running into this great abyſs.

BUT, though we may not hope to explore the extent of this ſpacious ſea, and ſurvey all it's parts; yet may we make ſome ſhort voyages in it, with conſiderable advantage. We may, like diligent coaſters, examine it's ſhores; obſerve the nature of the ſeveral ſtreams, that are flowing into it; compare their waters with thoſe of the great receptacle, into which they are received; go up, as far as we pleaſe, in each channel: and ſo return with greater profit, than we ſhould ever have gained by confining our commerce to a ſingle river.

To ſpeak without a metaphor. The degree of knowledge I would recommend to you, with regard to the *Arabic*, is, *firſt*, ſuch as may qualify you to read ſome eaſy books in that language; ſuch as *Abulfaragius*'s hiſtory of the dynaſties, *Abulfeda*'s life of *Mohammed*, the *ſecond* part of *Al-Makin*'s general hiſtory, &c. in print; and *Al-Macrizi*'s hiſtory of *Egypt*, *Abulfeda*'s geography, the *firſt* part of *Al-Makin*'s general hiſtory, &c. in manuſcript: by doing of which, you will gradually

dually become habituated to the *ſtyle* and *turn* of the *Oriental* idiom in *general*; and this you will find to be of great ſervice to you, when you come to conſider the meaning of any *particular* text in the *Hebrew*. *Secondly*, your knowledge ſhould be ſuch, as may enable you to conſult the *Arabic* lexicographers, ſuch as *Jauharius*, *Firouzabadius*, *Zammachſharius*, and others; who will not only ſhew you, that the greateſt part of the antient *Hebrew* words and phraſes *ſtill* remain in *common* and *daily* uſe among the people of the *Eaſt*; but alſo explain them to you in the ſame latitude and variety of meaning, in which they were uſed in the times that the ſeveral books of the *Hebrew* Scripture were written. In which reſpect, you may look upon the *Hebrew* to be ſtill a *living* language; and, conſequently, the *Old Teſtament*, that is written in it, to be capable of being more clearly underſtood (if ever the ſtudy of theſe languages ſhould come to be duly cultivated) than moſt of thoſe writings, that have been delivered down to us in *dead* languages.

HAVING thus acquainted yourſelves with the *nature* and *genius* of the *Arabic* tongue, and learned to conſult the *lexicons* that are written in it; you will ſeldom meet with any words in Scripture, which you will not be able, by theſe means, to give a good account of. Even the απαξ λεγομενα (as they are called in *Greek*) thoſe words which occur but *once* in Scripture, and ſo have *no* parallel inſtances, whereby to determine their ſenſes; and thoſe other, that occur but *ſeldom*, and ſo have very *doubtful* and *inſufficient* ones; may, by being compared with the words that anſwer to them in the *Arabic* dialect,

lect, and are of known uſe there, receive ſo much light, as will for ever fix the genuine meaning of moſt of them: and leave no more room to doubt of *their* ſignifications, than there is to queſtion the ſignifications of thoſe *Arabic* ones, from whence they received their illuſtration.

THIS is the method which I myſelf have, for many years, made uſe of in my own private ſtudy of the *Hebrew Bible*; and I beg leave to aſſure you, that what I take the liberty to recommend to you, I have found verified by my own experience in abundance of inſtances. I might mention ſome of them; but ſhall content myſelf, for brevity ſake, with referring you to that of טפוף, *taſôf*, in the following DISSERTATION.

AND, becauſe the language of the book of JOB has been allowed to have a nearer affinity with the *Arabic*, than that of any other part of the *Old Teſtament*: and, moreover, becauſe I have always been of opinion, that the *Proverbs* of SOLOMON not only ſhare the common advantage of other books of Scripture, in being capable of receiving light from the *Arabic* and the other dialects; but likewiſe have this peculiar privilege of their own, that, being a collection of wiſe *apophthegms*, or *moral ſayings*, they may admit of an additional illuſtration from the *Eaſtern* امثال, *Amthâl*, or *adagies*, which make a great part of the ethical and political wiſdom of the *Arabians* and *Perſians*, and have not only been preſerved in their ordinary converſation, but have likewiſe been gathered into volumes, and illuſtrated by the commentaries of their learned men:

men: for theſe reaſons, I have employed my thoughts chiefly on theſe two books; yet not ſo entirely neither, but that I have allowed myſelf time to conſider ſome other parts of the *Bible*, as they have occaſionally come in my way.

As to the book of JOB; I was ſo well ſatisfied of my being able, in ſome meaſure, to underſtand it by the method I am ſpeaking of, that, after I had read it over ſeveral times, and perceived the light that was continually darting in upon it from the windows of the *Eaſt*; and that not only with regard to particular words and phraſes, but likewiſe to whole ſentences and paragraphs; I reſolved to undertake a *new tranſlation* of it. But in this I found my attempts too ſanguine. For I had not gone many chapters, before I perceived that the difficulty of my undertaking conſiſted not ſo much in finding out the meaning of particular paſſages, as in connecting them together, and framing a conſiſtent ſenſe out of them; that the book of JOB in this reſembled the *Prophetical* writings, and the ſublime and figurative compoſitions of more modern *Eaſtern* authors, eſpecially the poets; and that the tranſition from one part of the diſcourſe to another was oftentimes ſo ſudden and unexpected, as to eſcape the notice of a reader unleſs very attentive: the lively imaginations of theſe *Eaſtern* writers tranſporting them with ſurprizing warmth and activity from one thing to another, and thereby cauſing them to overlook thoſe rules of method and connexion, which are obſerved by *Europeans* of a cooler and more regular fancy.

AND,

AND, what increaſed the difficulty of my undertaking was, that, about this time, I was called off to a very weighty employment of another kind; which proving of great benefit to me, (as it might be of ſome uſe to the world, if duly diſcharged) I thought deſerved a greater ſhare of my time, than was conſiſtent with that ſtrict and uninterrupted attention, which was neceſſary for penetrating into the deſign and oeconomy of this divine Poem; and, conſequently, for giving ſuch a tranſlation of it, as might, in any tolerable degree, expreſs the ſenſe of the Original. On theſe accounts I found myſelf obliged, for the preſent, to lay aſide the thoughts of making a continued and entire tranſlation of that book; though not without a proſpect of reſuming the deſign, when I ſhould be more maſter of my time and ſubject: and either of giving a new verſion of it, as I at firſt intended, or of leaving behind me ſuch notes and obſervations upon it, as might be of ſome uſe towards a new verſion, if they ſhould happen to fall into the hands of any one who has ſkill and opportunity to apply them to that purpoſe.

THE *Proverbs* of SOLOMON, the other book I propoſed to employ my thoughts upon, I found more favourable to my ſituation at that time. For theſe being, for the moſt part, ſo many *diſtinct* and *ſeparate* ſentences, might, I ſaw, be *diſtinctly* and *ſeparately* conſidered, as my time would permit. And a vacant hour might be uſefully employed in weighing the ſenſe of a *ſingle* ſaying, which would have been loſt in making out the

the meaning and coherence of a *longer*, and *more intricate* diſcourſe.

THIS advantage, which I perceived the PROVERBS had over the book of JOB, and moſt other parts of Scripture, was an encouragement to me to go on with my obſervations on them. And accordingly, having marked out ſuch of them, as I thought might be illuſtrated by the method I am here recommending, I reſolved to examine them one by one, as my other buſineſs would permit. This deſign I have now nearly compleated; and, upon a review of what I have done in proſecution of it, I find the number of *aphoriſms* I had occaſion to conſider, to be much greater, than I at firſt imagined they would be. My obſervations upon them I have drawn up in the form of ſo many DISSERTATIONS, of which the following (on *Chap.* VII; 22, 23) is a *Specimen*: though this being a text, about which there is a great difference of opinions among the interpreters and commentators, I was obliged to dwell longer upon it, than I have upon moſt others. What I offer in explication of it, I drew up above *eleven* years ago, and have often reviewed ſince that time; nor have I, after the moſt diligent enquiry, met with any thing to induce me to alter my opinion concerning the principal Criticiſm on which it is founded. However, I publiſh it, as I ſhall do every thing elſe of this nature, by way of *Conjecture* only. For where there is ſo much *doubt* among *learned* men, as there often is in theſe matters, it would ill become *me* to be *poſitive*.

If from this, or any thing elſe I may ſay or write in the ſame way, any ſmall benefit ſhall happen to accrue to you; I beg you will join with me in making ſuitable acknowledgments, where they are juſtly due, to thoſe worthy Governors of Colleges, whom Arch-Biſhop *Laud* entruſted with the choice of his *Arabic* Lecturer, and to his *Grace* the Arch-Biſhop of *York*, his *Majeſty*'s Lord Almoner: by whoſe favour my ſtation among you is become ſuch, as may in ſome meaſure excuſe my boldneſs in adventuring to lay before you, in this public manner, ſome papers, which were originally drawn up, and chiefly intended, for my own private exerciſe and improvement. And it ſeems to me not reconcileable with the intention of my Benefactors, to go on to enjoy the emolument, which they have provided for me; without holding myſelf obliged (as I have opportunity, and to the beſt of my abilities) to give the Public ſome account of what I do for it.

I am,

GENTLEMEN,

Your very faithful,

and affectionate humble Servant,

HERTFORD COLLEGE;
Mar. 16, 1742.

THO. HUNT.

A DISSERTATION ON PROVERBS VII; 22, 23.

22 הולך אחריה פתאם
כשור אל טבח יבא
וכעכס אל מוסר אויל׃
23 עד יפלח חץ כבדו
כמהר צפור אל פח
ולא ידע כי בנפשו הוא׃

22. *He goeth after her ſtraightway,*
As an ox goeth to the ſlaughter,
Or as a fool to the correction of the ſtocks:
23. 'Till a dart ſtrike through his liver;
As a bird haſteth to the ſnare,
And knoweth not that it is *for his life.*

WE have here in the compaſs of two verſes (according to the common diviſion) three Similitudes; the deſign of which is to repreſent, in the moſt lively and affecting manner, the folly and danger of the young *Adulterer*, who is the ſubject of this beautiful chapter. The meaning of the firſt and laſt of theſe ſimilitudes is obvious: that of the

ſecond is not ſo, as appears from the different opinions of tranſlators and commentators concerning it, and the ſeveral ways they have taken to reconcile it to the other two. The words of it are

כעכס אל מוסר אויל
עד יפלח חץ כבדו

As a fool to the correction of the ſtocks:
'Till a dart ſtrike through his liver.

BEFORE I proceed to examine this text by the RULE* laid down in the INTRODUCTION, and to offer ſuch an explication of it, as will make it of a piece with the context; it may be proper to ſee what account has been already given of it by expoſitors. And here, not to trouble the reader with their verbal criticiſms, the ſum of what they have advanced on the paſſage, with any probability, may be compriſed in theſe few words. *As a fool unwarily commits ſuch things, as will expoſe him to ſhame and puniſhment; ſo the incautious young man goes after his neighbour's wife,* 'TILL A DART STRIKE THROUGH HIS LIVER: that is, as ſome explain it, *'till the rage of jealouſy puſh the husband on to murder him*; or, as others, *'till he contract diſeaſes, and become habituated to impurity, and ſo ruin himſelf, both body and ſoul, by his lewd and diſorderly courſes.*

THIS is the uſual account, that is given of this place; but, I think, not the true one. For, not to mention

* Of making one of the *Hemiſtichs*, or *Half-Verſes*, a Comment upon the other.

that

that this interpretation ſuppoſes the fool's *going to the ſtocks* to ſtand for his *committing ſuch things as deſerve them*; which yet is no eaſy ſuppoſition: I ſay, not to mention this, it may be aſked, Where is the force of this compariſon? What is this, but to compare *one* fool to *another*; nay, a *greater* fool to a *leſs*; a fool that deſerves death (for *adultery* was capital among the *Jews*) to one that is incurring the moſt trivial and inconſiderable corporal puniſhment? To ſay, indeed, (as in the context) that the unwary youth purſues his unlawful amours without thought and conſideration, juſt as the *ox* goes to the *ſlaughter-houſe*, or the *bird* to the *ſnare of the fowler*, much improves the image we have both of *his* ſimplicity, and of the pernicious arts of the *temptreſs*: whereas, the comparing him to the *fool going to the ſtocks* is ſo far from heightening the idea we have of either, that it in a manner deſtroys our notion of both. Beſides, as this ſenſe is very low and incoherent in itſelf; ſo neither can the words be brought to ſpeak it, without great violence. According to the order in which they lie in the original, (כעכס אל מוסר אויל) their obvious conſtruction would be, not, *As a fool to the correction of the ſtocks*, but, *As the ſtocks to the correction of a fool*. And whoever has the leaſt acquaintance with the *Hebrew* idiom, will perceive, at firſt ſight, that the words ought to be taken in that order. But, what ſenſe will they have then?

SOMER, taking the ſignification of the word עכס *ekes*, here rendered *ſtocks*, from *Iſaiah* III, 18; (where it is applied to the *wanton daughters of Zion*, and by our tranſlators rendered *tinkling ornaments*) are of opinion, that

that it here likewiſe ſignifies rather ſomething *ornamental*, than *punitive*; rather a kind of *dreſs*, in which the *fool* went to his puniſhment, than an *inſtrument* of it: and conceiving likewiſe that the *Jewiſh* oxen were led to the place of ſacrifice with crowns and other ornaments upon them, as thoſe among the *Heathens* were, connect this with the former hemiſtich thus. *As the ox marches unconcerned, with a crown or garland on his head, to the place of ſacrifice; and a fool, in his tinkling ornaments, to the place of puniſhment: ſo this incontinent young man, allured by fair ſpeeches, and drawn in by promiſes of pleaſure and ſecurity, goes unthinkingly on to his own miſchief and ruin.* But this ſenſe is liable to the ſame objections with the former. The addition of *dreſs* does not alter the *impropriety* of the notion: the compariſon is ſtill foreign and inſipid; and the conſtruction repugnant to the letter of grammar, which would then be, *And the ornament to the correction of a fool*; and not, as in the tranſlation, *A fool to correction with an ornament.*

But, beſides theſe difficulties, which this account has in common with the other, it has likewiſe ſeveral of it's own. For, *firſt*, the word טבח, *tebahh*, properly ſignifies *ſlaughter*, or *butchery* in general; and is not to be reſtrained to the particular notion of *ſacrifice*, without ſome evident reaſon from the context. Neither, *ſecondly*, have thoſe, who have advanced this ſolution, made it appear, either that the *victims* among the *Jews* were ordinarily led to be ſacrificed in *crowns*; or that their *offenders* went to the *ſtocks*, or any other ſort of *correction*, in *tinkling ornaments*. *Thirdly*, The word

עכס

עכס, *ekes*, does not of itſelf ſignify any ſuch *ornament*, as the *fool* is here ſuppoſed to wear; as will be ſhewn by and by. *Fourthly*, and *laſtly*; to ſuppoſe that the *fool* is *actually going* to the place of puniſhment, as his having his *ornaments* on plainly does, deſtroys the propriety of the ſimilitude. For if he is *actually going* thither, he muſt be a *fool* indeed, (or, rather, a *mad man*, and ſo not a fit object of puniſhment) *not* to perceive it. And if he *does* perceive it, he is improperly ranked with the *ox* and the *bird*; who are therefore here ſet forth as fit emblems of the incautious young man, becauſe they go to meet their reſpective fates, *without the leaſt perception of their danger*.

But, after all; how comes the *Fool* in here? The deſign of Solomon ſeems to be to exaggerate, in the moſt lively manner, the folly and indiſcretion of the incontinent young Sinner, by comparing him to the ſilly unthinking *Brutes*. Having therefore taken his firſt compariſon from the *ox going to the ſlaughter*, it is more than probable he would have proceeded to ſome other *brute* animal, and not have thrown in the *fool* and the *ſtocks*, and then have gone to the *bird haſtening to the ſnare of the fowler*.

What this *ſecond* animal ſhould be, is not hard to conjecture. It is the *Hart*: a creature, from which compariſons are more frequently borrowed in the ſacred Writings, than from any other whatſoever; and therefore very fit to be joined with the *ox* and the *bird*, which are likewiſe very often introduced by the holy penmen on the ſame account: a creature too, of all others,

others, the moſt proper to be taken notice of on the preſent occaſion. For it is certain from the accounts we have of the antient hieroglyphics, that the uſual repreſentation, whereby the [a] *Egyptians* figured out a man overthrown by *flattery* and *fair ſpeeches*, as the young man in the text is deſcribed to be, was the picture of a *Hart* captivated and enſnared by the ſound of *Muſick*; which is one way of taking that animal. Add to this, that the compariſon we are here ſpeaking of, taken in this ſenſe, is no other, than what we have in the preceding chapter; where the wiſe man adviſes his ſon, if he ſhould bring himſelf into difficulties by paſſing his word for his friend, *to deliver himſelf as a roe from the* [b] *hand* of the hunter, *and as a bird from the hand of the fowler*; v. 5. Here the *roe* is mentioned with the *bird*, as the *hart* is ſuppoſed to be in the words before us. Now, it is well known, that *the hart* and *the roe* (or rather *the roe-buck* [c]) are often joined together in the

[a] See *Hori Apollinaris* Hieroglyphica Ægyptiaca. Lib. II, 87. Edit. *Nic. Cauſſini, Pariſ.* 1618.

[b] By the way, it may be obſerved, that the *Greek* verſion of the word יד *yad*, which uſually ſignifies *hand*, as our tranſlators have rendered it, is here βροχων, *ſnares*; which, perhaps, may be accounted for from the uſe of the *Arabic* verb يدي *yada*, which ſometimes ſignifies to *catch by the fore-foot*, and is by the lexicographers applied to the *roe*. So in *Kamus*, الظبي المبدي is *a roe caught by the fore-foot*. And if the ſame verb was anciently uſed in *Hebrew* to denote ſuch an *action*, as probably it was; why may not the noun יד *yad* ſignify the *inſtrument* of it?

[c] That the *Hart* and the *Roe-buck* are here diſtinguiſhed properly, as being of a different ſpecies, though with ſimilar qualities, appears from hence; that איל *cervus* has אילת and אילת *cerva* and אילות *cervæ*, as well as אילים *cervi*; and that צבי *roe-buck* has not only צבים

Scripture, as animals that bear a great reſemblance to each other in ſeveral qualities; ſuch as ſwiftneſs, beauty, and the like: and it is alſo certain from the natural hiſtorians, that the [a] method of *catching* them is exactly the ſame. As, therefore, in the former chapter, the *roe* and the *bird* were joined together, to repreſent an incautious man's *extricating himſelf out* of difficulties; why may not the *hart* and the *bird* be uſed in conjunction here, to expreſs his *running himſelf into* them: the *ſtrength* and *agility* of the *roe* being not more proper *there*, than the *ſimplicity* and *precipitancy* of the *hart* are *here*?

WHAT gave me the firſt hint of the *Hart*, after I had compared the hemiſtichs by the RULE laid down in the INTRODUCTION, and perceived the incongruency of the common tranſlation, was the word ἔλαφοι, *hart*, in the *Greek* verſion of the place. Obſerving this, I caſt my eye upon the other [b] antient verſions, the *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic*; and found them all concurring with the *Septuagint* in this ſenſe of the word. This

צבים, צביים, and צבאים *roe-bucks*, but alſo it's feminines צביה *roe*, and צבאות *roes*. This neceſſary diſtinction is further confirmed by *Deut.* 12, 15 &c. And therefore, the diſtinction between theſe ſeveral words, which are frequently confounded in our preſent Engliſh Verſion, ſhould be for the future very carefully attended to.

[a] *Capreæ*, ſays *Blondus* in *Geſner*, *leviſſimo cervo ſimiles ſunt, eâdemque arte, quâ cervi, decipiuntur.*

[b] All theſe make uſe of the very ſame word, that the *Hebrew* does; only written with different vowels, ſuitable to the reſpective languages: the Chaldee אילא *aila*, the *Syriac* ܐܝܠܐ *ailo*, the *Arabic* ايل *aiial*.

conſent of ſo many verſions of great antiquity and authority could not, I thought with myſelf, be without ſome very good foundation. And now, what ſhould that be, but that the ſeveral copies, from which they made their tranſlations, inſtead of אויל *avil*, a *fool*, as our preſent copies have it, read אייל [a] *ayil*, a *hart*; expreſſing (as is often done) the *yod* that was implied in the [b] *dageſh*? But theſe interpreters, not knowing what to make of *a hart to bonds*, *fetters*, or *chains*; and conſidering that theſe were more proper for a *dog*, than a *hart*; they in fact applied them to the [c] *dog*: and ſo

[a] So the words ſhould be written; when ſtripped of the diſguiſe, and incumbrance, of the *Maſoretical* Points.

[b] This is no new obſervation. For *Bochart* ſays, *Alii obſervârunt* Græcos *pro* איל, ſtulto, *legiſſe* איל, cervum: *Hieroz.* lib. II. cap. 56. ad fin. But, though *others* have obſerved this; I do not find they have made that uſe of their obſervation, which they might have done.

[c] It has been thought, that the *Septuagint*, inſtead of the preſent *Hebrew* word עכם, read כלב the uſual name of a *dog*. And if, indeed, κυων be the original reading of that verſion; the authors of it muſt have had ſome reaſon for their ſo rendering. But there is ſo wide a difference between עכם and כלב, that it is hardly credible the one ſhould ever have been miſtaken for the other. I ſhould rather think that theſe interpreters, when they were tranſlating this paſſage, had their eye on the *Greek* proverb, Κυων επι δεσμα, *A dog to Chains*, (which *Eraſmus*, not unſuitably to our preſent purpoſe, expounds of one *who plunges himſelf headlong into ſlavery, or miſery*; and adds, that *the ſaying is taken from dogs, whom you may eaſily chain, if you tempt them with a bait of meat*: *Adag.* Chil. II, Cent. VII, Prover. 67.) or, elſe, that they met with ſomething in the antient *Hebrew*, that appeared to them to favour that ſenſe; which is not impoſſible, if עכם, *akas*, in their days was underſtood in the ſame ſenſe that عكش *akaſh*, in *Arabic* is now, namely, of *dogs ſurrounding a bull*. *Kamûs*, in the word عكش.

made

made two ſimilitudes of one. For ſo the *Greek*; ὡσεὶ ἔλαφος ἐπὶ ἴχνεσι, ἢ ὡς ἄγρα ταχέως σπεύσαι εἰς τὸ ἕλκος.[a] And in like manner, the other verſions juſt now mentioned. Whereas, had they reflected, that the word מוסר *muſar*, from whence they ſeem to have had their δεσμὸς, might as well ſignify[b] *toils* or *ſnares*, as *chains* or *bonds*; they would not have found it improper to be conſtrued with the *hart*.

THUS far, then, we are got; *As a hart to the toils*: and, I think, without much difficulty. If the reading of יעל *aiil*, a *hart*, for יעל *avil*, a *fool*, ſhould be thought to be any; it may be anſwered, That though, in our expoſitions of the ſacred Text, we ought to be extremely cautious how we do any thing that may in any wiſe ſhake the authority of the preſent readings:

[a] A very learned and ingenious friend gueſſes, that the true reading of the LXX verſion may be this: ὡσεὶ ἔλαφος ἐπὶ ἴχνεσι, ἢ ὡς ἄγρα ταχέως σπεύσαι εἰς τὸ ἕλκος. &c. *Sicut* [vadit] *cervulus in rete cervus*, &c. *Bochart* gueſſes that χυφὸν may be an error of the ſcribe for χυφὸν, which ſignifies a ſort of inſtrument for *confining*, or *puniſhing* offenders; as likewiſe the *offender* himſelf, who has deſerved to be ſo *confined*, or *puniſhed*. By the ſame liberty, I may conjecture that it is inſtead of κοῦφον, which ſignifies *lifting up*, or *making light and eaſy*; and then it will favour the interpretation which will be hereafter given of פוּך, and anſwer to κοῦφα, 1 Chron. XII, 8; where it is ſaid, κοῦφα ὡς ὄρνεα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη.

[b] The word, in this ſenſe, is taken from יסר, which ſignifies both to *take* and *detain captive*; and may eaſily be applied to the *taking* of the *hart*, whether we ſuppoſe it done by *ſurrounding* him with *toils* or *nets*, which *Budæus* in *Geſner* calls *cathiſcum ſeptum*; or *hampering* him in the nooze of ſome ſuch ſort of *ſnare*, as the *Greeks* call ἀνδρακίδα, of which we have a large deſcription in *Xenophon's Cynegetics*.

yet, where the variation is ſo exceedingly minute, as in the caſe before us, which, ſetting aſide the Vowels (a mere invention of the *Rabbins*) we ſhall find to be no more, than the changing of a ſingle *vau* into a *yod*, which might have been occaſioned, as it has been in many other words, by a ſlip of the pen ſo ſlender, as to eſcape the notice of the moſt careful and attentive tranſcriber: where, I ſay, the variation conſiſts in ſuch a ſlight punctilio, ſuch a mere iota, as this; I hope we may, without any injury or irreverence to the majeſty of the divine Oracles, be allowed the ſame liberty with regard to them, which ſober and inquiſitive men have taken with other writings; and, where we meet with a reading, which will not, after our beſt labour and pains with it, afford a tolerable ſenſe, preſume to offer another, that ſeems to have a better.

THE holy Scriptures, though dictated by the Spirit of GOD, were committed to the cuſtody of *Men*; and were to be delivered down to future ages after the ſame method, as all other writings are, that is, by ſucceſſive tranſcripts of them. And though we cannot, without great impiety, ſuppoſe that the eye of Providence would not be in a particular manner watchful over this ſacred depoſitum, in which it's own glory and the good of mankind were ſo nearly concerned; yet, to extend this divine interpoſition in behalf of the integrity of the *Bible* ſo far, as to deny the poſſibility of a variation in ſo very minute a circumſtance as this before us, is to run ourſelves into a greater difficulty on the other ſide; and that is, to maintain that the ſeveral tranſcribers, through whoſe hands this book has paſſed, were exempted

empted from all poſſibility of miſtake; which we cannot do, but by ſuppoſing them to have been perpetually under the immediate influence of divine inſpiration: a ſuppoſition, which thoſe, who declare the moſt warmly againſt different readings, will not, I believe, be forward to allow.*

The poſſibility, then, of ſuch a variation being admitted; it will follow, that wherever we have occaſion to ſuppoſe any (which, as I hinted before, ſhould never be ſuppoſed but in caſes of the utmoſt neceſſity, and where all other means fail) it will not only be allowable, but incumbent upon us, to give it a thorough examination; and to take all the advantage it will afford, in favour of a rational, coherent ſenſe: eſpecially, where ſuch various reading has not only the reaſon of the context, but likewiſe the authority of the moſt antient verſions, to plead for it, as the preſent has. This is not only doing juſtice to common ſenſe, but putting theſe primitive tranſlations to their proper uſe; to the uſe for which they were deſigned by God himſelf: who, in purſuance of his gracious intention not only of *publiſhing*, but likewiſe of *preſerving* the venerable inſtructions, he had vouchſafed to mankind by the pens of his choſen Servants, was pleaſed to raiſe up a number of

* The alteration of one ſimilar Letter for another, though formerly leſs admiſſible, will be now more eaſily granted, wherever there appears good reaſon from the Context: ſince the Hebrew *MSS*, happily diſcovered by *Dr Kennicott*, have been proved to contain multitudes of much greater Variations; and even the *printed* editions are found to differ very often, and eſpecially in the ſimilar Letters.

men

men, in very early times, and in different countries, to translate them into their reſpective languages, as the moſt effectual means to ſecure both theſe important ends.

But, to return. Thus far, I ſay, we are got; *As a hart to the the toils*, or *ſnares*. There remains the word עכס, about which interpreters are much divided; as they are about other words, which ſo ſeldom occur as this does. Our's, conceiving it to ſignify ſomething *punitive*, render it *ſtocks*: and many others, to the ſame purpoſe. But were there any grounds for this ſenſe, as there are none; it could not be proper here. For, what has the *hart* to do with *ſtocks*? Some other meaning, then, more ſuitable to the place, muſt be looked after. In doing which, we may obſerve, that we have nothing either of this word, or any other of the ſame original, but what we meet with in the IIth. of *Iſaiah* above mentioned: and here it occurs but twice; once by way of verb, and once by way of noun; and, conſequently, all the light our preſent *Hebrew* is capable of giving it, muſt be derived from thence. And, becauſe in *Hebrew*, as in all the dialects ſprung from it, the verb is the radix from which the word is formed, and by which it's ſignification is determined; it is fit we begin with the verb: the notion of which being once ſettled, that of the noun will follow of courſe. The Prophet, then, in the chapter before us, upbraiding the *Jewiſh* women, (or, as ſome think, the [a] effeminate part of the *other* ſex) for the wantonneſs and extravagance of their be-

[a] Which they would have to be hinted at in the maſculine pronoun הם *hem*, *their*, affixed to the word רגלי *ragli*, *feet*.

haviour

haviour and apparel, ſays of them, among other things, that they did מרגלים תשחקנה, *beraglibem teshhaſ-nah*, which the LXX render by [illegible], *Playing*, or *ſporting with their feet*: the [a] *Syriac*, *Dancing with their feet*: the printed [b] *Arabic*, like the *Greek*, which it often follows in the prophetical books, *Playing with their feet*: [c] an *Arabic* tranſlation never yet printed, like the *Syriac*, *Dancing*, *ſkipping*, *capering with their feet*: all, much to the ſame purpoſe. Here then we have ſufficient authority for fixing the ſenſe of the word עקב, as we had above for ſubſtituting the *hart* in the place of the *foot*; namely, the concurring ſuffrages of many antient verſions, in all which, as we have ſeen, the verb has the notion of *playing*, *ſkipping*, *dancing*, or the like. [d] And, what further confirms this ſenſe, is it's agreement

[a] صلوخ حزلحسه.

[b] يلعبن باقدامهن.

[c] رقصي بارجلهم. This *Arabic* tranſlation of *Iſaiah* and the other Prophets is in *Pocock*'s collection of MSS. numb. 260.

[d] Nor is the *Arabic* notion of the ſame verb unſuitable to the preſent ſubject. It ſignifies primarily to *bend*, *wind*, or *twiſt*, and thence, by a metaphor, *to move in and out*, or *from one ſide to another*; like *a viper*, ſays *Jauharius*; like *a drunken man*, ſays *Zamachſharius*; and ſuch a ſort of *winding* and *crooked* motion is commonly made uſe of by the hunted *hart*, which, ſays *Geſner* from *Budæus*, *Inſignes fugæ mæandros implicare ſolet*. And hence, perhaps, it was, that a manuſcript *Arabic* tranſlator, who renders the preceding words מסוף ורוצה by يمشي يتلون *they go bounding up and down*, or *throwing themſelves from ſide to ſide*, here retains the verb عكس, *akaſa*, the very *Hebrew* נכס, as thinking it the moſt proper to expreſs the ſenſe of the place; rendering, بارجلهم يعكسن i. e. *They made ſuch a motion with their feet*, as is implied in the verb عكس. Poc. numb. 32.

with

with that of the preceding words, טפוף תלכנה, *taſof telaknah*; where the word טפוף, *taſof*, which our *Engliſh* tranſlators render *walking and mincing as they go*, (marg. *tripping nicely*) being an απαξ λεγομενον, (no where to be met with but in this place) may perhaps receive ſome light from the *Arabic*: in which language the word طف *taffa*, as explained by the author of the great *Arabic* lexicon called *Kamûs*, ſignifies the ſame with the two verbs خف *khaffa*, and دف *daffa*, to be *light*, *nimble*, *ſprightly*, *briſk*, &c. and, when applied to an *horſe*, the ſame with وثب *wathaba*, to *leap up*, *caper*, *prance* &c. Now what can be more proper to come after ſuch a word as this, than the verb עכס *akas*, taken in the notion of *ſkipping* or *bounding*?

And agreeable to this ſignification of the verb עכס *akas*, here, will that of the noun עכסים *akaſim*, be at the 18th verſe; and תפארת העכסים *tifereth haakaſim*, will literally be *The ornament of the dancings*: that is, according to the idiom of the ſacred tongue, *Their dancing ornaments*.[a] What ſort of *ornaments* theſe were, cannot, perhaps, be preciſely determined: it being extremely difficult, at this diſtance of time, to find a key to the wardrobe of the *daughters of Zion*; and to give a diſtinct account of the ſeveral kinds of dreſs, which the Prophet enumerates in this and the following verſes. But, whatever it was; whether a particular ſort of [b] *ſhoes*, as ſome ſuppoſe it to be; or [c] *bells* about their

[a] The *Arabic* tranſlator, juſt now mentioned, calls it الافتخار بالاخفاق i. e. *The pride they take in their light and nimble motions.*

[b] *Jarchi*'s Comment.

[c] *Kimchi*'s Comment.

ſhoes,

ſhoes, which rung as they went, as others; or [a] *chains* or *bracelets* about their legs, (ſuch as [b] travellers tell us are worn by the *Eaſtern* women at this day) as others rather think: whatever it was; it's *uſe* undoubtedly depended upon it's *motion*. And, if it made a *tinkling*, as our tranſlators, and others ſuppoſe; the *ſound* of the

[a] See *R. Tanchum*, in his Lexicon, called *Murſhid*; of which very valuable Work, *never yet printed*, more than one MS is preſerved among the Oriental Treaſures in the Bodleian Library.

[b] So *Rauwolf*: *They alſo wear* RINGS *about their legs and hands, and ſometimes a good many together; which in their ſtepping and working, ſlip up and down about their legs and feet; and ſo make a great noiſe.* *Ray's* collect. of *travels* and *voyages*, pag. 166. And of this cuſtom Mr *Sale* interprets thoſe words of *Mohammed*, in the 24th chapter of the *Korân*; لا يضربن بارجلهن, *Let them* (i. e. the *women*) *not make a noiſe with their feet*, &c. That is, ſays he, *by ſhaking the* RINGS, *which the women in the eaſt wear about their ancles, and are uſually of gold or ſilver.* And then he adds, (what ſhould not be overlooked on this occaſion) *The pride, which the* Jewiſh *Ladies of old took in making a* tinkling *with theſe* ornaments of their feet, *is among other things of this nature ſeverely reproved by the prophet* Iſaiah. Tranſlation of the *Korân*, pag. 192. And Mr *La Roque*, *in his voyages*, has given us the *Arabic* name of their RINGS: *Elles* (les femmes) *ont d' autres gros anneaux creux, ou plutôt de cercles garnis de petits anneaux, qui pendent à l' entour. On remplit ces creux de petits cailloux, qui ſonnent comme des grelots lorſqu'elles marchent: ces gros anneaux ſont overts par un endroit en forme de croiſſant, par où elles paſſent le plus menu de la jambe. Enfin ces anneaux, qu'on appelle* Khalkhal, —— *ſont autant de ſonnets qui avertiſſent que la maîtreſſe du logis, ou d' autres femmes paſſent; alors les domeſtiques ſe tiennent dans un certain reſpect, les autres perſonnes ſe cachent, ou ſe retirent pour ne pas les regarder.* Voyage, p. 264. The *Arabic* name, which Mr *La Roque* gives us, is خلخل; which is the very word, by which *R. Tanchum* and other *Arab Jews* interpret עכסים *akaſim*.

ornament was owing to the [a] *geſticulation* of the perſon that wore it, as that of their *chains* at this time is obſerved to be: there being not the leaſt room to fix any other notion to the noun, than what it has from the verb, which is that of *dancing* or *ſkipping* in general, whatever the particular manner of doing it may have been. [b]

AND now, to apply what has been ſaid to the caſe before us; I take the word עכס to be the participle (Benoni) from the verb עכס *irruit*; agreeably to the participle הולך *ambulans*, at the beginning of this ſentence; and in perfect analogy with מהר *feſtinans*, the participle likewiſe from מחר: which laſt participle has the כ prefixed here at the head of the third ſimilitude, in a manner exactly parallel to כעכס at the head of the ſecond. And this word עכס I take to ſignify the ſame here, as תעכסנה *teakkaſnah* does, *Iſaiah* III, 16; *viz.* to *dance*, *ſkip*, or *bound*. To which if we add the notion of the *Arabic* [c] عكش *akaſh*, to *ruſh into*, or *run upon*,

[a] And this was *Calvin*'s opinion of the thing, who ſays; *Libenter recipio illam interpretationem, quòd* SONITUM AMBULANDO EDIDERINT. See his Comment.

[b] As ſo much depends, in this Diſſertation, on the meaning here aſſigned to this word עכס; it may give additional ſatisfaction to the Reader, if he is acquainted, that this Senſe has been adopted as true, for the reaſons here given, in the learned Dr *Taylor*'s Hebrew Concordance. And in the Bible publiſhed by the learned *F. Houbigant*, in 1753; this ſenſe of the words אויל and עכס, in this place, is adopted likewiſe.

[c] The author of *Kamûs* explains it by the two *Arabic* words حمل and عطف; both which ſignify (among other things) to *ruſh upon*, or *run into*. He likewiſe compares it with احاط, to *encompaſs*, or *ſurround*; and applies it to *dogs incloſing*, or *beſetting a bull*, as was above obſerved: a notion not unſuitable to this place.

(for

(for the final letters are commutable) the ſenſe of the place will be, *As an hart ſkips*, or *bounds*, or *ruſhes into the toils*. After which will follow, in the moſt natural, proper, and eaſy ſenſe of the words, *until a dart ſtrike through his liver*. And to this ſenſe agrees the verſion of *Symmachus*; who, though he read אויל, *aviil*, and not איל, *aiil*, (as his αφρων, *fool*, plainly ſhews) yet renders עכס by σκιρτων, *leaping*; as proper a word, as any he could have choſen, whereby to expreſs the *nimbleneſs* and *agility* of the *hart*.[a]

LET us now read the two verſes together, pointed agreeably to this ſenſe. *He goeth after her ſtraightway, as an ox goeth to the ſlaughter: Or as an hart boundeth into the toils, 'till a dart ſtrike through his liver: As a bird haſteth to the ſnare, and knoweth not that it is for his life.*[b] Here the *firſt* and *ſecond* ſimilitudes are of a piece with each other, and make a conſiſtent ſenſe with the *third*: and the whole is a beautiful gradation; the different degrees of ſpeed, by which the *ox*, the *hart*,

[a] It will give ſome additional ſtrength to the preceding remark; if we obſerve, that in *Joel* i, 17, the verb, which is now עבשו, is by the LXX rendered σκιρτησαν, probably by their reading עכשו or עכסו; inſtead of עבשו, as it is at preſent: for the verb עבש is found in this place only.

[b] The word פתאם, in the firſt verſe, which is here rendered *ſtraightway*, is by the LXX tranſlated κεκραφθως, *decoied, ſeduced, infatuated*, &c. in the notion of פתה, *ſeductus, pellectus fuit*. The Greek words are, ο δε επηκολουθησεν αυτη κεκραφθως. Agreeable to which is an *Arabic* tranſlation, never yet publiſhed; رايته متعلقا وراها وهو غاو, *I ſaw him going after her, infatuated as he was*. Poc. MSS. Bodl. lib. Num. 285. But this makes no alteration in the ſenſe of the paſſage.

and the *bird*, are reſpectively carried on to *their* deſtruction, aptly repreſenting the ſeveral advances, by which the young *Sinner* goes on to *his*; ſetting out ſlowly and reluctantly at firſt, but quickening his pace afterwards, and preſſing on with eagerneſs and confidence, in proportion to the lengths he has gone.

IN what has been here ſaid, two things having been ſuppoſed, concerning the manner of *taking* the *hart*; namely, that he is firſt *enſnared*, and then *ſhot* with a *dart*, or *arrow*: it may not be amiſs to add a word or two, to ſhew that the antient way of hunting this ſort of game was agreeable to both theſe ſuppoſitions. And here, not to tire the reader's patience with a multitude of quotations from authors; I ſhall content myſelf with one, being, I think, full to the point, and ſufficient of itſelf to ſet the thing beyond all manner of doubt. And that is from *Xenophon*, who having in his *Cunegeticks* deſcribed at large the method of circumventing, or entrapping the *Hart*, concludes with theſe words, Χρη δ' εαν ουτως ελῃ, —— εαν μεν ῃ αρρεν, μη προσιεναι εγγυς· τοις γαρ κερασι παιει, και τοις ποσιν· αποθεν δι ακοντιζειν i. e. *when the* ELAPHOS *is thus caught*; *if it be a male, you muſt not go near him, for he ſtrikes both with his horns and his feet*; *ſo that you muſt let your darts fly at him at a diſtance.* This account of the method of deſtroying the *hart* is exactly the ſame with what is ſuppoſed in the preceding tranſlation. He is firſt *caught*, whether in the nooze of the ποδοσκαφη above mentioned, or the *net*, or any other ſort of *trap* or *ſnare*; and then is *diſpatched* with a *dart*, or *arrow*: the original חץ ſignifies both.

IN

IN the *Nova Acta Eruditor. Lipſ.* 1745, pag. 307, there is a Critique on the preceding Diſſertation; and ſome notice ſhould, perhaps, be here taken of it. I ſpeak thus doubtfully; becauſe many will think it quite unneceſſary, to direct the Reader's attention to what will contribute very little to his entertainment or inſtruction. Had there been any one part in that piece of Criticiſm, which had pointed out any real miſtake of mine; I would have acknowledged it here, with thanks. But the truth is; that, in near three pages of remarks, the only things which are proved are theſe two. The firſt is, that the Critic is very ſufficiently diſpoſed to be cenſorious; and that this diſpoſition of his has led him into more than one Miſrepreſentation. And the ſecond is, that the juſtneſs of my own tranſlation appears to much greater advantage (and there is no preſumption in aſſerting it) when compared with the following tranſlation of this Gentleman.

QUI *eam conſectatur, repente tanquam bos ad mactationem, et tanquam* PEDICA *ad referendam ſtulto gratiam,* VENIUNT, *donec ſagitta jecur* EJUS *trajiciatur, et tanquam avis ad laqueum propere devolat, neſciens, eum ſibi perniciosum fore.* And, that this rendering may be the more exactly compared with my own; I will expreſs it as faithfully as I can, in Engliſh, thus.

He, who followeth her,
Suddenly as an ox to the ſlaughter,
And as a fetter *to thank the fool,* they come,
'Till his *liver is pierced through by a dart,*
And as a bird haſtily flieth to the ſnare,
Not knowing, that it will be deſtructive to him.

In conſequence of the ſeveral remarks, ſubmitted to the learned Reader in the preceding pages; I ſhall now conclude this Diſſertation with the words of the Original Text, and with what I apprehend to be the proper Tranſlation of them.

22 הולך אחריה פתאם
כשור אל טבח יבא
וכעכס אל מוסר אויל [אייל]:
23 עד יפלח חץ כבדו
כמהר צפור אל פח
ולא ידע כי בנפשו הוא:

22. *He goeth after her ſtraightway,*
As an ox goeth to the ſlaughter:

23. *Or as an hart boundeth into the toils,*
'Till a dart ſtrike through his liver:

24. *As a bird haſteth to the ſnare,*
And knoweth not that it is for his life.

A

SERMON

PREACHED

BEFORE THE

UNIVERSITY OF *OXFORD*;

ON

December 10, 1769.

A

SERMON

PREACHED

BEFORE THE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

ON

December 12, 1756.

A SERMON

ON

PROVERBS XIX. 2.

Alſo, that *the ſoul* be *without knowledge*, it is *not good*: *And he that haſteth with* his *feet*, *ſinneth*. *

IN diſcourſing on this Proverb, I ſhall do theſe two things.

I. I ſhall examine into the Connexion there is between the two parts of it; and, by conſidering each as a Comment on the other (as the two members of theſe moral Diſtichs generally are) endeavour to find out the true Senſe of the whole. And,

II. I ſhall explain the Doctrine it contains, according to this Senſe.

I. I ſhall examine into the Connexion there is between the two parts of this Proverb; and, by conſidering each as a Comment on the other, endeavour to find out the true Senſe of the whole.

* גם בלא דעת נפש לא טוב
ואץ ברגלים חוטא׃

AND, becauſe the latter of theſe two verſicles is the plainer, I ſhall begin with that; hoping, that by the clearneſs of this latter part of the Proverb, I ſhall be enabled to throw ſome light back on the former. This latter part is, *He, that haſteth with his feet, ſinneth:* where, if we take the word *feet*, in a figurative and moral ſenſe, for the *motions* and *inclinations* of the mind (as it ſometimes ſignifies) perhaps the verb *ſinneth* may not be amiſs; *raſhneſs* and *precipitancy* in theſe *motions* and *inclinations* being often the occaſion of much *ſin* and *wickedneſs*. But if we take the word *feet*, in it's natural and literal ſenſe, for the members of the Body ſo called, as it here ſeems to ſignify; it would be better to uſe *erreth*, inſtead of *ſinneth:* and ſo the Hebrew verb ſignifies in many places of Scripture. I ſhall mention only two, as being full in point. The firſt is *Judg.* 20, 16; where it is ſaid of the Children of *Benjamin*, that *they could ſling ſtones at a hair-breadth, and not miſs:* the original word for *miſs* is the ſame, which in our text is rendered *ſinneth*. The other is *Job* 5, 24; where Eliphaz, addreſſing himſelf to Job, tells him, that if he would ſubmit to the diſpenſations of Providence, and bear his ſufferings patiently, he ſhould be reſtored to his former eſtate and proſperity: *Thou ſhalt viſit thy habitation*, ſays he, *and ſhalt not ſin. And ſhalt not err*, ſays the margin: that is, when thou lookeſt for thy dwelling, which thine enemies had threatened to demoliſh, or from whence thou hadſt been driven, thou ſhalt find it ſafe, and ſhalt not *miſs of it*; which is undoubtedly the ſenſe of the place. From theſe two paſſages it appears, that the Hebrew verb in the text, which

which our tranſlators render *ſinneth*, ſometimes ſignifies no more than to *miſs of a thing*, to *err*, or *go aſtray*. And I might, as I ſaid, have brought ſeveral more texts to juſtify the ſame ſignification. I therefore render this latter clauſe of the aphoriſm; *He, that haſteth with his feet, erreth*, or is apt to go out of his way.

THIS is a plain propoſition; as containing a truth, founded on common obſervation and experience. And now let us ſee, what light it will reflect on the former part of the Proverb; which is more obſcure. It is, *That the ſoul be without knowledge, it is not good*; or, as one Greek Verſion has it, more categorically, and, I think, more agreeably to the original, *The ſoul without knowledge is not good.*[a] Now, what analogy is there between this part of the Proverb, and that which we have been explaining? What ſort of *knowledge* is that, the want of which Solomon may be here ſuppoſed to compare to *precipitancy of feet* in a haſty traveller?

TO anſwer theſe queſtions; it will be proper to ſtate the true meaning of the word *Soul*, which is the ſubject of the propoſition. The Original word for *Soul* is *nepheſh*, which is uſed in ſeveral ſenſes. I ſhall mention two; which are the principal, and which ſeem to be chiefly intended by Solomon in this place. Sometimes the word *nepheſh* is taken for the *intellectual* faculty of the human mind, or the *Underſtanding*; and then it is

[a] Χωρις επιστημης ψυχη ουκ αγαθη. See theſe words, in *Grabe*'s Edition of the Alexand. MS; inſerted there, in a leſs character, as being from ſome later Greek verſion than that of the LXX.

rendered, as here, *Soul*. So it is taken *Prov.* 2, 10; where *knowledge* is ſaid to be *pleaſant to the ſoul*. So it is taken Chap. 15, 32; where *he, that refuſeth inſtruction*, is ſaid to *deſpiſe his own ſoul*. And ſo (to go no further than this book for inſtances of this meaning) it is taken Chap. 24, 14; where it is ſaid, that *knowledge of wiſdom* is ſweet *to the ſoul*. In theſe places the word *nepheſh* ſeems to be taken for the *Underſtanding*, the ſeat of knowledge and wiſdom. According to which ſenſe, *want of knowledge* will be want of due *inſtruction* or *information*; and the perſon, who is ſo unhappy as to have ſuch an *Underſtanding*, will be fitly compared to a haſty traveller, who ſets out on his journey, before he knows any thing of the road he is to to take. At other times, the word *nepheſh* is taken for the other faculty of the human mind; and, inſtead of *Soul*, is rendered *Will*, *Pleaſure*, *Luſt*, *Deſire*, &c. So *Pſ.* 27, 12; David begs of God not to deliver him over *unto the Will* of his enemies; the Hebrew is בנפש, *unto the Soul* of his enemies. So *Deut.* 23, 24; Moſes tells the Iſraelite, *When thou comeſt into thy neighbour's vineyard, thou mayeſt eat grapes at thy Pleaſure*; (Heb.) *according to thy* Soul. So in that noble hymn *Exod.* 15. at the 9th v. Moſes repreſents Pharaoh as ſaying to the people of God, whom he was in purſuit of, *My Luſt* (Heb. *my Soul*) *ſhall be ſatisfied upon them*. So, to uſe no more quotations, it is ſaid of the proud ambitious man, *Habak.* 2, 5; that *he enlargeth his Deſire as hell*; the Hebrew is, *he enlargeth his* Soul. And theſe places may ſuffice to juſtify the other ſenſe, in which I ſaid *nepheſh* or *Soul* is taken; namely, for the *Will* or *Appetite*. And ſo it is taken in the *Arabic* language; as likewiſe for that

that which is the conſequence of indulging the *Will*; *haughtineſs of ſpirit, ſuperciliouſneſs, diſdain*, &c. According to this ſenſe, *want of knowledge* will be want of *diſcretion, prudence, temper*, or ſome ſuch good quality. And the perſon, who has his *Will* deſtitute of theſe good qualities, will be very fit to be compared to *a haſty traveller*; who either may not have informed himſelf of the nature of his journey; or, if he has, yet afterwards purſues it ſo eagerly and haſtily, that his inconſiderate ſpeed either carries him out of the way, or tires him, before he arrives at the place he was bound to.

UPON the whole: by the *ſoul's being without knowledge*, we may underſtand the two principal faculties of the human mind being without their proper diſcipline and direction; the *Underſtanding* without information and inſtruction, and the *Will* without prudence and diſcretion. And, as the want of theſe qualifications is the ſource of all the errors and miſcarriages, that happen to us in our journey through life; the perſon, who has the misfortune to labour under this want, is, not without great elegance and propriety, compared to *a haſty traveller*, who for want either of informing himſelf of his way at firſt, or of purſuing it with proper caution and circumſpection afterwards, miſſes his road, and wanders about in endleſs perplexity and diſtreſs.

AND this *liableneſs of the human mind to error*, when it's two ſuperior faculties are left deſtitute of proper culture and information, is what ſeems to be meant by it's *not being good*: for this phraſe, being here put to anſwer

ſwer the verb *erreth* in the other part of the Proverb, muſt ſignify ſomething analogous to it, and conſequently muſt mean it's not being *uſeful* for the purpoſes for which it was given us; it's not being a *good* and ſafe guide to us, in the conduct of our lives; or rather, (as the expreſſion is by interpreters generally underſtood not of a mere privation of *good*, but of the actual preſence of a great degree of the contrary quality) it's being a very *bad*, [a] inſufficient, and dangerous guide. And, indeed, when it is thus with the human mind; when it's two ſuperior faculties, which were given us for the direction of our actions, are ſuffered, for want of due care and management, to lie idle and uſeleſs; and ſo, inſtead of guiding us aright, become the ſources and occaſions of error and deception: what is there then left to conduct us, in our pilgrimage through life? *If this light, that is in us, be darkneſs; how great is that darkneſs?*

And thus much concerning the *Connexion* of the two parts of the *Proverb*, and the *Meaning* of the whole [b].

[a] See the phraſe לא טוב, in Chap. 20, 23 of this Book; and in other places. See likewiſe *Mercer*'s Comment on the Text.

[b] A very different verſion of theſe words has been offered by the celebrated Profeſſor *Schultens*; who renders גם here by *vigor currendi ſeſe animans*: and the Arabic language is referred to, as authorizing ſo very ſtrange a verſion. On which account I think it neceſſary to obſerve, that, though I earneſtly recommend ſome acquaintance with the Arabic language; yet it is alſo my duty to caution againſt an intemperate fondneſs for it, and againſt every violent application of meanings fetched from thence: eſpecially, where the Hebrew words admit an eaſy ſenſe, agreeably to the uſage of the ſame words in other Hebrew paſſages. The uſe of גם, as a particle, is exceedingly frequent; and it is often found

at

I now proceed to the other thing I propoſed; which was,

II. To conſider the *Doctrine* it contains, according to this *Meaning*.

In ſtating the meaning of the Text, I obſerved, that under the word *Soul* were comprehended the two ruling faculties of the human mind, the *Underſtanding*, and the *Will*: and that the *Soul* might then be ſaid to want *Knowledge*, when theſe two faculties were not cultivated and improved, as they ought to be; that is, when the *Underſtanding* was ſuffered to remain without *information* and *inſtruction*, and the *Will* without the guidance of *prudence* and *diſcretion*. I ſhall, at this time, conſider the *Soul* in the firſt ſenſe only; or as it may be taken for the *Underſtanding*: and endeavour to ſhew, that, without proper diſcipline and inſtruction, even this ſupreme, this boaſted faculty of the human mind, is *not good*.

For, if we take a view of the *Underſtanding*, unimproved by inſtruction and education; what *good* ſhall we find in it? In this uncultivated ſtate, it has no other *goodneſs* to boaſt of, than what the Almighty beſtowed

at the beginning of other Proverbs, where it is rendered very naturally by *even*, or *alſo*, as here. And indeed here that rendering ſeems particularly proper: becauſe of the connexion between *haſting with the feet* and *ſinning* (or *erring*) in this verſe, and *walking in integrity* in the verſe preceding: eſpecially, when the latter part of the former verſe is rendered — *than he that is perverſe in his ways* &c. See *Dr Kennicott*'s Second Diſſertation; pag. 287.

upon

upon it, when he made it what it is, and endowed it with the capacity it has; that is, ſuch a ſort of *goodneſs*, as he declared to be in all his Creatures, when he pronounced them to be *very good*, that is, very fit for the ends and purpoſes for which he made them. Without this goodneſs, the *Underſtanding* would ceaſe to be what it is. And yet, even this conſtitutional, or (as I may call it) this metaphyſical *goodneſs* of the Underſtanding may be greatly impaired, if not totally deſtroyed, by our own careleſneſs and neglect. The powers of the *Underſtanding*, if not ſometimes exerted and called forth into action, grow inert and languid, and at laſt loſe their natural ſtrength; reſembling in this the Bodily Organs, which require motion and exerciſe to keep them in health and vigour, and qualify them for the diſcharge of their ſeveral offices.

In the Text, the power of *thinking* and *reflecting* (the great buſineſs of the *Underſtanding*) is compared to that of *walking*. Now, as there have been men, who, by neglecting to exerciſe their *legs* and *feet* for a long time together, have been in danger of loſing the uſe of them; ſo have there been men, who, for want of training up their intellectual faculties to *thought* and *reflection*, have always found a ſtiffneſs and lameneſs in theſe faculties; have never been able to *think* and *reflect*, as they ſhould do; but have hobbled on all their lives long in the purſuit of Knowledge, without making any progreſs in any one branch of it.

Would we therefore enjoy the bleſſing of a *good Underſtanding*? let it be our care to *make* it a *good* one.

As

As it came out of the hands of our Creator, it was only a *faculty*; but ſuch a one, we ſee, it is, as GOD, in his wiſdom, has vouchſafed to pronounce *good*. And ſo it is, as far as it concerns GOD; be it our buſineſs to make it ſo, as far as it is *our* concern. GOD has done *his* part; let us be careful to do *ours*. GOD has given us the *power* to be wiſe; let us make uſe of the *means*: let art perfect, what nature has begun. The beautiful Statue, that lies hid in a rude block of marble, is not to be fetched from thence, without the chiſel of a Phidias or a Praxiteles. Nor will the Seed, or Kernel of a vegetable unfold itſelf, and diſplay the ſpacious Tree, or lovely Flower, that lies in miniature therein; without the help of the gardener's ſkill, to cultivate it, and bring it to maturity. It is the ſame with the Mind of man: though the ſeeds of many good qualities may be ſown therein, yet, without the aſſiſtance of a good education, to open and expand them, they will never be able to find their way thence, or bring forth any fruit to perfection. GOD has given us Capacities for noble attainments; but has left the care and management of them to ourſelves.

THERE are two things, that may hinder our improving the *Underſtanding*, as we ought to do. The one is, our imagining it to be naturally ſo *good*, as not to need any improvement; the other is, our imagining it to be naturally ſo *bad*, as to be incapable of any. I am afraid, the former is the more common error of the two; men being more apt to *lean to* their own *Underſtanding*, than to diſtruſt the ſtrength of it. They are both dangerous extremes; the one aſcribes too much to the

bounty of nature, the other too little. As to thoſe who aſcribe too *much* to nature, and imagine their *Underſtanding* to be ſo *good* by birth, as to need no improvement; let them conſider, that the beſt may be made better. The brighter our intellectual Abilities, the more capable they are of improvement; and the greater blame ſhall we deſerve, if we improve them not. We read in the Goſpel, that the Servant, who had received *five talents*, did not look on that ample proviſion as a privilege for idleneſs, but went and traded with them, and gained *other five talents*; and he is commended for the improvement he had made of his ſtock — *Well done, thou good and faithful ſervant*; — *enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!*

NOR let any one imagine his *Underſtanding* to be naturally ſo *bad*, as to be incapable of improvement. However imperfect it be; it is the Gift of GOD, and was beſtowed on him for *good* purpoſes. GOD is the ſupreme diſpoſer of all things; and it is from Him, as from their univerſal Lord, the ſons of men have received their ſeveral abilities and capacities. They are His ſtewards; and are accountable to Him for that portion of *Underſtanding* He has been pleaſed to allot them. Art thou then in the number of thoſe, who have been ſparingly dealt with, as to their ſhare of intellectual endowments? Hath thy Maſter entruſted thee but with one talent? Make the beſt of that one talent. That ſingle talent may avail thee much; if employed in a right way, and put to a proper uſe. Thou art not to hide it in a napkin, and to neglect to improve it; becauſe one of thy fellow-ſervants has received twice, and another

another five times as much. Something, no doubt, may be done both for thy Maſter's ſervice, and thine own advantage, even with that one talent; he would not elſe have given it thee: and ſomething, be ſure, he will require of thee at his coming. It will be no excuſe for thee to ſay, thou thoughteſt it too little, to concern thyſelf about. The enquiry will then be, how thou haſt employed what thou hadſt: and ingratitude, the baſeſt of all crimes, will never atone for thy idleneſs. Envying thy neighbour, who has received and improved his five talents, will be ſo far from making any addition to that one which thou haſt neglected, that even that one ſhall be taken from thee, and given to him that hath five.

And, as the *Underſtanding* has no pretence to be idle, on account either of it's being naturally ſo *good*, as not to *need* improvement; or naturally ſo *bad*, as not to be *capable* of any; ſo neither has it any pretence to be ſo, for want of proper objects to exerciſe itſelf upon. Both the volume of the *Creation*, and the volume of *Revelation*, lie open to it's view; in the former it may read the *Works*, in the latter the *Will*, of it's great Creator. And what *good* can there be in that *Underſtanding*, which will learn from neither? To be more particular. As man is a compound both of Body and Soul; the things, that fall under the cogniſance of his *Underſtanding*, muſt relate either to the one, or to the other; and conſequently the objects, which are to employ our intellectual faculties, will divide themſelves into *ſpiritual* and *temporal*, or, in other words, into thoſe that relate to *this* life, and thoſe that relate to the *other*. And what a ſpacious field is here, for the *Un-*

derſtanding to exerciſe itſelf in! It extends to every thing, that is poſſible to be known by us; and is commenſurate to our utmoſt capacities.

For, to begin with that part of it, which lies open to us in *this* life: what a ſcene of contemplation does the goodly Fabric of the Univerſe preſent us with! That immenſe Space, in which all things exiſt and move; what an idea does the conſideration of it give us of that omnipreſent Being, who *filleth all in all?* The contrivance, harmony, order, beauty of the ſeveral celeſtial Orbs; what are they, but ſo many inſtances of the wiſdom and power of the Divine *Geometrician*, who made them all in number, weight, and meaſure; and left them to engage the ſpeculation, and excite the wonder, as well as ſupply the uſe, of the reſpective creatures, that either inhabit them, or have any connexion with them! And, if we deſcend to theſe lower parts of the creation; there too the *Underſtanding* will find abundant matter to entertain and improve itſelf. What a compaſs of knowledge (attainable in part by every curious enquirer) do the Holy Scriptures aſcribe to the author of my Text; when they tell us, that *he could ſpeak of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyſſop that ſpringeth out of the wall: that he could ſpeak alſo of beaſts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fiſhes!* And if from vegetables and animals we proceed to Ourſelves, who partake of the nature of both; what volumes have been written on the ſtructure and organization of the Human Body; and what a conſiderable attainment is it for man, even in a phyſical ſenſe, to know Himſelf! And now we are mentioning

mentioning *natural* knowledge; what a fund of entertainment do the Mathematical Sciences (thoſe handmaids of natural knowledge) afford the human mind; to underſtand the various properties and combinations of numbers, the nature and menſuration of the ſeveral ſorts of ſuperficies and ſolids; and to be able to apply them to the purpoſes of geometry, aſtronomy, navigation, and the like! To the hiſtory of Nature we may add that of Mankind, which opens and enlarges the mind more than any other ſort of knowledge; and makes the experience of nations, the moſt remote from us in time and place, our own. It ſets before us their manners, cuſtoms, laws; their revolutions and changes, together with the cauſes that produced them; and, by ſhewing us what proved beneficial, or hurtful to Them, teaches us what We are to purſue, or avoid.

But, above all, what a variety of fine inſtructions has Morality to offer to the *Underſtanding!* The lectures it gives us on temperance, juſtice, fortitude, the government of our paſſions, the contempt of every thing unworthy the dignity of our nature, and the like; if duly attended to, how happy would they make us in ourſelves, and how uſeful to thoſe about us! Morality likewiſe ſets before us the many Relations, which we ſtand in one to another; and acquaints us with the ſeveral Duties, that reſult from thence: all of them neceſſary to be known and practiſed by us, if we would ſuſtain the characters of good parents and children, huſbands and wives, brothers and ſiſters, maſters and ſervants, governours and ſubjects; or behave ourſelves well, in any of the ſocial and reciprocal offices of life.

To the ſtock of materials, which the contemplation of the Works of Nature, and the other branches of knowledge, here deſcribed, have provided for the *Underſtanding* to exerciſe itſelf upon, we may add thoſe it receives from the Ingenuity and Induſtry of man. It would be endleſs to recount the various Arts and Occupations, that tend to the preſervation of the lives, health, peace, plenty, ſafety, comfort of mankind; and he that has knowledge but in the meaneſt of theſe, is ſo far uſeful to the Society to which he belongs. The body politic can no more ſubſiſt without the offices of the inferior members, than the body natural. Even here the *eye* cannot ſay to the *hand*, or *foot*, I have no need of thee. As was obſerved above, the ſmalleſt ſtock of intellectual Abilities, if duly improved, will turn to good account. It may not perhaps advance men to the higher ſtations and employments of life. It may not, if improved to the uttermoſt, introduce them into *public counſel*, nor enable them to *ſit high in the congregation*: it may not promote them *to the judges ſeat*, nor qualify them to *underſtand the ſentence of judgment*: it may not teach them *to declare juſtice and judgment*, or bring them *where parables are ſpoken*. But it will inſtruct them to be uſeful to their country, in ſome inferior ſtations; *to make furrows*, (as the ſon of Sirach goes on to expreſs himſelf) *to give the kine fodder, to cut and grave ſeals in great variety, to counterfeit imagery, to turn the potter's wheel, and to faſhion the clay with thine arm*: in a word, *to truſt in thine hands*, and *to be wiſe in thy work*. And we know that, *without theſe, a city cannot be inhabited*; nor can *the ſtate of the world be maintained*.

Let

LET not any man's *Underſtanding* therefore lie idle and unimproved, on pretence of wanting proper matter to exerciſe itſelf upon. We ſee what a large field of knowledge the contemplation of the things, that concern *this* life only, opens to us. And, to encourage us to learn, it has pleaſed the good providence of GOD to divide out Knowledge into ſeveral parts or portions, adapted to the ſeveral capacities of the ſons of men, who are to be engaged in the cultivation of it; ſome of them indeed not to be approached but by men of exalted intellectual abilities; whilſt there are others, in which perſons of inferior parts may be very uſefully employed.

FROM the things of *this* world, let us paſs on to thoſe of the *other*; from the *Works*, to the *Will*, of our great Creator. And if, as we have ſeen, the *Underſtanding* be not *good*, without the knowledge of the former; much leſs will it be ſo, without the knowledge of the latter. In the ſenſe of the Text, the human Intellect is more or leſs *good*; when the knowledge, about which it is converſant, is more or leſs worthy of it's purſuit. And if it be a great reflection on the Underſtanding, to be unread in the book of *Nature*; it will ſtill be a greater, to be unread in the book of *Grace*: foraſmuch as the inſtructions contained in *this* are infinitely more important, than thoſe that are contained in *that*.

WITHOUT the knowledge of our Creator, all our other intellectual attainments are of little worth: they are at beſt but empty amuſements; unſatisfactory often

to

to ourſelves; of little ſervice, and ſometimes of great miſchief, to our fellow-creatures: their duration, no longer than this preſent ſpan of being; of ſome little recommendation to us, while we *know in part*; but of no account to us in that other ſtate, where ſuch *knowledge ſhall vaniſh away*. It is the knowledge *that is from above*, which ſhall be then our ſupport and confidence: the knowledge of the Perfections, the Will, the Ways, the Counſels of the great GOD of heaven and earth: theſe truly to have known, we ſhall at laſt find to be the Perfection of knowledge; becauſe to have known theſe will be *Everlaſting Life!*

I have now gone through with what I intended to offer, on this ſaying of the wiſe man. Give me leave to recapitulate, in a few words, what I have ſaid; and I will conclude. By the *Soul*, in the firſt part of the Text, I have preſumed to be underſtood the two principal faculties of the human mind, the *Underſtanding*, and the *Will*; and have ſhewn that the *Soul* of man may then be ſaid to be *without knowledge*, when theſe two faculties are not cultivated and directed, as they ought to be; that is, when the *Underſtanding* is ſuffered to remain without *information* and *inſtruction*, and the *Will* without the guidance of *prudence* and *diſcretion*. In which unhappy circumſtances, theſe two faculties will be of no more uſe to us in the conduct of our lives, than (to uſe the compariſon in the Text) a pair of precipitate *Feet* are to a haſty *Traveller*; the more he obeys their motions, the further they will carry him out of the way. And, becauſe to have ſhewn this of both theſe faculties, would, I found, have taken up more

more time, than is at preſent allotted me, I have confined myſelf to the conſideration of one of them, but this the principal of the two, the *Underſtanding*. And, to make good the Wiſe Man's aſſertion in the Text, I have ſhewn that even the worth of this noble faculty, which men are ſo apt to value themſelves upon, and with the want of which they ſo little like to be upbraided by others, depends on the uſe they make of it; that this power, like other natural powers, is no further *good*, than it is exerted; and that it is poſſible (I may add, perhaps more common than we are aware) for men to neglect exerting their *Underſtanding* ſo long, 'till they have greatly impaired, if not totally loſt the faculty. And I obſerved further, that there are two ſorts of men, who are apt to be guilty of this neglect; thoſe, who imagine their *Underſtanding* to be naturally ſo *good*, as not to *need* improvement; and thoſe, who imagine their *Underſtanding* to be naturally ſo *bad*, as to be *incapable* of any. To the former of theſe I have recommended to conſider, that there is no *Underſtanding* naturally ſo *good*, but it may be made *better*: to the latter, that there is no *Underſtanding* naturally ſo *bad*, but it may be *good* for *ſomething*. I have obſerved laſtly, that as there is no man, but has ability of *Underſtanding* for ſomething or other; ſo there is none, that can want proper objects to exerciſe it upon, while ſo extenſive a field of knowledge, as I have above pointed out, lies open before him; which is no leſs than the *Works* and the *Will* of the great GOD of the Univerſe; the important Concerns of *this* life, and the far more important ones of *that which is to come*. And he, who, amidſt ſuch a variety of noble and intereſting objects,

will be ſo baſe as to ſtarve his intellectual faculties for want of knowledge, deſerves not the name of an *intelligent* creature; but may more juſtly be reckoned in the number of thoſe, who, in the language of the Pſalmiſt, have NO *Underſtanding, and may be compared to the beaſts that periſh.*

To conclude therefore. Would we make our *Underſtandings good*, in the phraſe of the Text; let us exerciſe them to *good* purpoſes. Let us ſo employ them on things temporal, that we ſuffer them not to loſe ſight of the things eternal. Let Learning and Religion, for our improvement in the knowledge of both which we were ſent hither, go hand in hand. And whilſt we are purſuing one part of the buſineſs of this Place, and making ourſelves good Philoſophers and good Scholars; let us by no means neglect the other part, which is of infinitely the greater conſequence of the two, the making ourſelves good Men and good Chriſtians.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS I, 17.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS I, 17.

כי חנם מזורת חרשת
בעיני כל בעל כנף׃

Surely in vain the net is ſpread
In the ſight of any bird.

THE Adverb חנם, *in vain*, may be taken in two different views; for it may refer either to the *Bird*, or to the *Fowler*. With reſpect to the *Bird*; the *Net* may then be ſaid to be *ſpread before his Eyes* IN VAIN, when the *Bird* does *not* take warning by it to avoid it: with reſpect to the *Fowler*, when the Bird *does* take warning by it, and avoids it. Of theſe two ways ſome Expoſitors take the former, ſome the latter. Dr *Hammond* takes the latter; and, to accommodate the words to the context, underſtands them as repreſenting the Perſon, who ſhall ſuffer himſelf to be circumvented and enſnared by the Temptations, which the Wiſe Man had been cautioning him againſt, to be more irrational than the ſilly *Birds* themſelves — who, if they can but diſcern the *Nets* or *Toils* that are laid for them, have the ſenſe to take care of themſelves, and to make uſe of their wings for eſcaping the danger.

BUT

But Biſhop *Patrick*, who came after him, prefers the other way; and, I think, with good reaſon. For the *Bird* is not an animal, which is noted for any caution or foreſight, in avoiding the ſnares that are laid for him. On the contrary, he is by *Solomon* himſelf (Chap. VII, 23) made uſe of as a fit image of the folly of the young inconſiderate Adulterer; for this very reaſon, becauſe *he haſteneth to the ſnare of the fowler, and knoweth not that it is for his life*. So that the *Net is laid before his eyes* IN VAIN; not becauſe he has the *prudence* to beware of it, and ſo to render the *Arts* of the Fowler *vain*; but becauſe he has the *imprudence* to fall into it, and ſo to render *vain* what might have been a *ſufficient notice* to him. And in this view, Birds become a proper Emblem of the infatuated Robbers and Murderers, deſcribed in the foregoing Verſes; who, being led on by the ſpecious baits of large and rich Spoils, purſue their wicked courſes with ruin and deſtruction ſtaring them in the face; and are ſo intent in laying plots for the Lives of others, that they never conſider the danger to which they are expoſing their own. And this is the application, which *Aben-Ezra* makes of the Compariſon. *The Net*, ſays he, *is in vain laid for the Bird*, שלא ידאג, &c. *Becauſe he does not ſee it, nor is afraid of it, 'till he lights into it. He ſees the Bait, that is in it; but not the Net. So theſe Men ſee what they want to catch; and ſay, We ſhall find all precious ſubſtance: but do not ſee the Net they are going into.* And to the ſame purpoſe *Jarchi*; כי העופות
והיאורת חטי וקטניו מוריס על הרשת חנם הוא
בעיניהם שאנם מכירים על מה היא נוצרת ויורדין

בה

ברה ואוכלין: *when Birds ſee wheat and other ſmall grain ſtrewed over the Net; it is in vain [laid] in their ſight: for being not aware for what reaſon it is ſtrewed, they light upon it, and eat.*

I have ſet down theſe words at length, in the Author's own language; becauſe they ſeem to confirm a conjecture I have ſometimes made, concerning the meaning of the word מזרה. The radix of it is זרה, which does not, as I find, in the whole Scripture ſignify to *ſpread* or *expand*, as it is here commonly rendered; nor is it elſewhere applied to רשת *Net*; but is always taken in the notion of *diſperſing*, *ſcattering*, *ſprinkling*, *ſtrewing*, and the like: which gives room to think that it's participle מזרה, here joined with the the ſaid רשת *Net*, ſhould not be rendered *ſpread*, or *laid out*; but *ſtrewed*, or *ſprinkled*, viz. with *Corn*, by way of *Bait*. This is very agreeable to the Expoſitions given by the two Jewiſh Doctors juſt now mentioned, the latter of whom has the very word מזרים, *ſtrewed*: inſtead of מזרה רשת, *the Net ſpread*, putting חטה וקטנית מזרים על הרשת, *Wheat and other Grain ſtrewed over the Net*. And this ſignification of the word זרה may be further ſupported by the known uſe of ذرى; which, according to Schindler, anſwers to it in the Arabic tongue, and ſignifies *diſpergere*, *ventilare*, *ſpargere ſemen* &c. from whence ذرى *grana diſperſa*; ſuch as the Net is here ſuppoſed to be *baited* with. Let us now ſee how the words, as here explained, will ſtand with the context.

כי

כי רגליהם לרע ירוצו 16
וימהרו לשפך דם :
כי חנם מזורה הרשת 17
בעיני כל בעל כנף :
והם לדמם יארבו 18
יצפנו לנפשתם :
כן ארחות כל בצע בצע 19
את נפש בעליו יקח :

16. *For their feet run to evil,*
And make haſte to ſhed blood.
17. *For in vain is the net ſtrewed* with grain,
In the eyes of any bird.
18. *And theſe men lay wait for their own blood;*
They lurk privily for their own lives.
19. *Such are the ways of every one, that is greedy of gain;*
It taketh the life of the poſſeſſors thereof.*

* I render the word יקח by *taketh*, rather than *taketh away*; becauſe it ſeems to carry on the alluſion to the buſineſs of *Fowling* from which ſome terms are in the preceding verſes borrowed. And for this I have the authority of *Aben-Ezra*; who turns the laſt clauſe, *The Spoil taketh the Spoiler.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XIX, 10.

לא נאוה לכסיל תענוג
אף כי לעבד משל בשרים׃

Delight is not ſeemly for a fool:
Much leſs for a ſervant to have rule over princes.

FOR תענוג, the LXX have τρυφη: the Vulgate, *Deliciæ:* our Tranſlators, *Delight:* and others, ſomething to the ſame purpoſe. But this notion of the word, though perhaps not amiſs in itſelf, corresponds but ill with the other Hemiſtich. For what Connexion is there between the *Delight of a Fool* and the *Dominion of a Servant?* Expoſitors therefore, in order to preſerve the Correſpondence, uſually make out in Paraphraſe what the Tranſlations want in Expreſſion; and by *Delight* underſtand *Riches*, *Honours*, *Preferments*, and the other Gifts of Fortune. Theſe are commonly looked upon as productive of *Pleaſure*, and *Delight*; and, though graceful and ornamental to a *Wiſe Man*, who knows how to make a right uſe of them, are ſo far from being *ſeemly for* a *Fool*, or becoming *him*, that they only ſerve to make him more remarkably ridiculous in himſelf, as well as troubleſome to thoſe about

 him;

him; and therefore very fit to be coupled with the *vile Slave domineering over his betters* in the next Hemiſtich. And in this latitude the word is frequently taken by the Sacred Writers, in their Deſcriptions of the *Plenty* and *Proſperity* both of particular Perſons, and of whole Kingdoms; as may be ſeen *Pſ.* XXXVII, 11; *Eccleſ.* II, 8; *Iſai.* LVIII, 14; *Jer.* VI, 2. In the laſt of which places the LXX accordingly render it by τρυφος: wherein, though perhaps they have not exactly repreſented the ſenſe of the Original, they have however left us their ſentiments with regard to the ſignification of the word. And thus far we may proceed in accommodating the two parts of the Verſe to each other, upon the Authority of the *Hebrew*. The *Arabians*, who have adopted the verb ענג, have preſerved ſuch a ſenſe of it, as will perhaps make the Coherence here ſtill more viſible. With *them* this verb ſignifies, *Capiſtro ducere*; from whence come the ſeveral nouns عناج *Juſſio, Poſſeſſio:* عنجج *Magnus*; معنج *Qui res aggreditur*. Here then we have *Power* and *Dominion* added to *Proſperity* and *Affluence*; and may render the Words in ſome ſuch way as this.

לא נאוה לכסיל תענוג
אף כי לעבד משל בשרים:

It is not ſeemly for a fool to hold the reins of government;
Much leſs * *for a ſervant to have rule over princes.*

* *Much leſs:* in as much as the *Tyranny* and *Inſolence* of the one is far more intolerable, than the *Weakneſs* and *Incapacity* of the other.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XIX, 22.

תאות אדם חסדו
וטוב רש מאיש כזב׃

The deſire of a man is his kindneſs:
And a poor man is better than a liar.

I SHALL introduce what I have to offer upon theſe words, with a Remark which I have already made in the Introduction; namely, that the *Proverbs of Solomon*, being for the moſt part looſe and independent Sentences, are not capable of receiving that light from the Context, which the more connected paſſages of Scripture are; and conſequently will not admit of the ſame method of Explication. But then, they have a Method of their own; and ſuch a one too, as, if duly regarded, will ſerve as an uſeful clue to conduct us through the intricacies of theſe *dark ſayings, and to bring us to the Knowledge of a Proverb, and the Interpretation thereof.* Theſe wiſe Aphoriſms are divided into Two Parts, called *Hemiſtichs.* And theſe Hemiſtichs are generally connected together by the Hebrew particle *Vau*; which in our language is rendered by *and*, or *but*, according as the ſubject-matter of the

Proverb will admit. If the ſubject-matter of both parts be the ſame; it is rendered *and*, and denotes the *Agreement* there is between them: if different, it is rendered *but*, and denotes the *Diſagreement*. In the one caſe, the latter Hemiſtich is put by way of Confirmation of the former; in the other, by way of Oppoſition to it: and in both caſes, the two Hemiſtichs mutually explain each other.

To apply this obſervation to the Proverb before us. The firſt Clauſe of it is, *The deſire of a man is his kindneſs*. But is it a Confirmation of this, to ſay, *And a poor man is better than a liar?* What connexion is there between theſe two Clauſes; what foundation in the Senſe, to warrant our coupling them together in ſuch a manner? Do they thus explain; or, rather, do they not darken and obſcure each other? A plain indication, that the Tranſlation cannot be right. The truth is, this Aphoriſm is of the *oppoſite* kind, which our Tranſlators ſeem not to have been aware of; and a beautiful *Antitheſis* between the two parts of it there is: as will appear from an attentive examination into the genuine meaning of two or three of the Original Words. I ſhall take them in order as they come.

The firſt is תאות; which many of the Interpreters render, as ours do, *deſire*; expounding it in an active ſenſe, *What a man deſires*. But this expoſition, though agreeable to the uſe of the word in ſome other places, does not ſeem to be proper here; as not ſuiting with חסדו ſubjoined: which is not ſimply *kindneſs*, but His *kindneſs*; as the ſuffix ſhews it to be — *What he deſires is*

is HIS *kindneſs*. Now if it be HIS, why ſhould he *deſire* it? He cannot *want* an Habit, which he has *already acquired*: unleſs it be ſaid, as it is by ſome, that by *deſiring* is meant his *ſeeking for* opportunities of *exerciſing* that lovely Quality he is *poſſeſſed of*. This, no doubt, is true of every *good* man; but not of man *in general*, of whom it is here affirmed; acts of *Unkindneſs* being more the objects of ſome men's *Deſires*, than acts of *Kindneſs*. Nor does this Interpretation ſuit the notion of תאות in this place, which (as will appear from a fuller view of the Contraſt there is between the two parts of the Verſe) does not ſeem ſo much to denote what a man is *deſirous of himſelf*, as what renders him *deſirable to others*: not ſo much the *Delight* he takes in *his own* good actions; as the real Value and Eſteem they procure him from *thoſe*, who have received the benefit of them. So that, inſtead of *the deſire*, it would perhaps be better (if the word would be admitted) to render it *the deſirableneſs*: paſſively, that for which a man *is deſired, beloved, courted*, &c. And this is no new ſenſe of the word תאות; as we are aſſured by a very great Maſter of the Eaſtern Languages,[a] who (in his learned Note upon Chap. XVIII, 1 of this Book) brings our Text as an inſtance to prove, that לתאוה there ſhould not be rendered *through deſire*, but *for the ſake of becoming deſirable*; which latter is undoubtedly the true ſenſe; the end of a contemplative man's *ſeparating himſelf*, or retiring from the world (which is the

[a] The late celebrated Profeſſor *Schultens*. See his *Animadv. Philolog. & Critic. in varia loca Vet. Teſtam.* p. 236, 237. See likewiſe his *Proverbia Salomonis*; p. 210, 211.

ſubject

ſubject of that Proverb) being, by his uſeful Studies, to lay in ſuch a ſtock of Wiſdom and Knowledge, as may render him *deſirable*, or worthy the Eſteem of Mankind. And to this Text he adds two more, in ſupport of *his* Interpretation; which equally favour *ours*. The one is *Gen.* III, 6; where what in our Verſion is *pleaſant* to the eyes (the original word for *pleaſant* is תאוה) is in others *deſirable*, or *delightful*. The other is Chap. XLIX, 26 of the ſame Book; where תאות, which we render *utmoſt bounds*, is by others rendered *deſirable fruits*, *delectable things*, &c. which indeed ſeems to be the better interpretation, as being the more agreeable to *Deut.* XXXIII, 15; where *the chief things of the antient mountains, and the precious things of the laſting hills*, make likewiſe a part of the Bleſſing on Joſeph.

THESE Texts may be ſufficient to juſtify the notion we have given of תאוה; which is, that of making a man *deſirable*, or *amiable*. And to this the Greek Verſion, if rightly underſtood, will be found to agree. It is χαρπος ανδρι ελεημοσυνη: where, if we take χαρπος in the ſenſe of the Latin *fructus*, (from *fruor*) which ſignifies not only *fruit*, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, but likewiſe *enjoyment*, *emolument*, *advantage*, &c. which ſenſe the Lexicographers tell us it ſometimes has; * the meaning of the LXX will then be, (the very ſame we have been hitherto advancing,) *the Enjoyment of a man* (that which procures him real *Comfort* and *Advantage*) is his *Readineſs to give Alms*, or to relieve the Diſtreſſes of the poor and miſerable. It is his *bene-*

* See *Stephens*.

ficent

ficent and *charitable* Behaviour, which makes him *happy* in himſelf, and promotes his *Intereſt* with other men.

AND ſo much for the Firſt Hemiſtich: with which the Second will now be found to have a very natural and eaſy Correſpondence. For as by the word חסד, in what we have been explaining, we underſtand an Habit of *Charity* and *Beneficence*, an *open*, *tender*, *generous* Diſpoſition: ſo here the character of the perſon termed in our Engliſh Verſion *a Liar*, in the Original כזב, is the very reverſe of theſe amiable Qualities. He is a *cloſe*, *deſigning*, *falſe-hearted* wretch; one that is all *Art* and *Hypocriſy*, that makes pretences of Friendſhip, only to betray his Friend: in ſhort, one that has *Ability* to do good things, but an *Inclination* to do very bad ones; and ſo appears to be leſs eſteemed in the eyes of Solomon, than the *Poor* Man, who has the *Will*, but wants the *Power*. That this is no more than what his name כזב imports, may be learnt from ſeveral other places of Scripture.

THUS the Pſalmiſt, to ſhew the little Truſt and Confidence that is to be placed in the Sons of Men, of what rank or condition ſoever they be, calls them כזב, *a Lie*, in the abſtract; *i. e.* mere Deceitfulneſs and Treachery: *Pſ.* LXII, 9. And when a Spring *fails*, or *is dried up*; it is ſaid (*Iſai.* LVIII, 11) כזב *to lie*, as *diſappointing* and *fruſtrating* the hopes of the thirſty Traveller, who comes to it for refreſhment. And the ſame ſenſe has אכזב, in *Jer.* XV, 18; where the Prophet, complaining of GOD's *withdrawing* his wonted Aſſiſtance

Aſſiſtance from him, thus expoſtulates: *Wilt thou be altogether unto me as a Liar; and as waters that fail*; or, as the margin has it, *are not ſure?* [a] Where, for *as a Liar*, (a very harſh and improper expreſſion indeed, conſidering the tranſcendent Dignity of the great Being ſpoken to) an able Writer [b] rightly ſubſtitutes *Diſappointment*, as a more decent word to be uſed on the Occaſion. But perhaps the whole Expoſtulation will appear ſtill more decent; if we apply the *Diſappointment* to the *Waters*, (to which the Original plainly refers it) and not to GOD: and render it, *Wilt thou be unto me as the* DISAPPOINTMENT (*or* FAILING) *of waters, which are not ſure*, or, to be depended upon? Which is evidently the conſtruction of the words; there being nothing before מים in the Original to anſwer to the Conjunction *and* before *Waters*. Accordingly, the LXX, underſtanding the word אכזב adjectively, render the whole, ὡς ὕδωρ ψευδὲς. And ſo the Syr. and Arab. In this view, the Text has nothing in it *unworthy of God*; an Objection, which a late Writer makes to our common Tranſlation. [c] But, as in other places of Scripture, the *Plenteouſneſs of the Divine Goodneſs* towards Mankind is ſhadowed out to us, by the Sacred Penmen, under the Emblem of a *Fountain of living Waters*; (and a delightful Emblem indeed it is, eſpecially to the Inhabitants of dry and hot Countries!) ſo here, on the other hand, the prophet *Jeremiah*, labouring under

[a] היו תהיה לי כמו אכזב מים לא נאמנו׃

[b] *Dr Waterland* in his *Scripture Vindicated*, Part III. For which ſenſe he quotes the authority of *Cocceius*; who in his Lexicon renders the words, *Fies mihi ut fruſtratio.*

[c] The Author *of Chriſtianity as old as the Creation.*

ſome

ſome bitter Affliction, which he apprehends to be the effect of the Divine Diſpleaſure, repreſents the *Diſcontinuance* of GOD's Favours to him under the ſimilitude of a *Fountain*, whoſe Reſervoirs are *dry* for a long time together; and ſo balk the Expectation of thoſe, who come for Water: an image as mortifying and uncomfortable, as the former is chearing and pleaſant.

ANOTHER Text, which may ſerve to ſettle the meaning of the word כזב in this place, is *Hoſea* XII, 1: where the *treachery* of *Ephraim* and *Iſrael* in making a covenant with the *Aſſyrians*, whilſt under-hand they ſought to *Egypt* for help againſt them, is called כזב *a Lie*, or *Lying*; that is, as the learned Dr *Pococke* obſerves, whatever deceived the Hopes of their Allies, falſe Speaking, falſe Dealing, falſe Pretences &c. I ſhall mention but one Text more; and that is *Micah* I, 14: where the Prophet declares of the Houſe of *Achzib*, that it ſhould prove (in alluſion to it's name) to the Kings of Iſrael, לאכזב, *a Lie*, ſay the Tranſlators; that is, as the ſame great Man expounds it, *It ſhould deceive them*, or *fail their expectation*.

FROM all which Texts it appears, that our Engliſh word *Liar* is of too narrow and confined a ſignification to expreſs the full import of the Original כזב, which ſignifies a *Deceiver* in general; one, who is no more to be truſted in his Actions, than credited in his Words; who is all Artifice and Fraud; who keeps no Faith, is true to no Engagement; and ſo is incapable of being a true Friend. And in the ſame latitude is the word taken in the *Arabic* language; where the verb كذب,

which anſwers to the Hebrew כזב (for ז and ס are commutable letters) ſignifies not only to *lie*, but to *deceive*; *not to do what one ought to do*; *to be deficient*, or *to fail* in any thing. And thence, when the Milk of a Camel goes off, and is dried up; it is ſaid to *lie*, * or *deceive*; the very ſame expreſſion, which, as we have ſeen above, is applied to *Waters*, in *Iſai.* LVIII, 11.

TAKE now this Hemiſtich, according to the account thus given; and join it to the former, as above explained: and the ſenſe of the whole verſe will be, as follows.

תאות אדם חסדו
וטוב רש מאיש כזב׃

The deſirableneſs of a man is his kindneſs;
But a poor man is better than a man of deceit.

* Thus *Jauharius* explains this verb, in his Lexicon; ſaying, كذب لبن الناقة اي ذهب, which words ſignify *Mentitum eſt lac camelæ, id eſt, abiit.* And to the ſame purpoſe *Zammachſharius.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XIX, 24.

טמן עצל ידו בצלחת
גם אל פיהו לא ישיבנה׃

A ſlothful man *hideth his hand in* his *boſom,*
And will not ſo much as bring it to his mouth again.

THERE is no vice, which *Solomon* ſo frequently and ſo ſtrictly cautions us againſt, as that of *Idleneſs.* The variety of topics, he makes uſe of on this occaſion, is very remarkable. There is ſcarce a poſture of the body ſo ſupine, or diſpoſition of the mind ſo indolent, or condition of life ſo wretched, or advantage of fortune ſo neglected, or opportunity of acting ſo unimproved, or field ſo uncultivated, or vineyard ſo undreſſed, or houſe ſo ruinous and paſt repair; from which he does not either fetch arguments, or draw compariſons, in order to deter us from the dreadful conſequences of a ſluggiſh behaviour. And great reaſon had he often to put us on our guard againſt the Enchantments of *Sloth.* He well knew, that the beſt rules he could lay down for the conduct of human life would prove ineffectual, without a proper degree of *induſtry* to put them in practice; and therefore, in order to ſecure the im-

portant end, he wiſely inſiſts on a *diligent* uſe of the means. Now among the many remarks which he makes on the *Sluggard*, in order to create in us an abhorrence of his Crime, there is none more ſevere, than that of the text, when cleared from the errors of interpreters, and underſtood in the ſenſe in which he delivered it.

A ſlothful man *hideth his hand in* his *boſom*;
And will not ſo much as bring it to his mouth again.

Or, as it is in ch. 26, 15 (where it occurs again, for it ſeems to have been a favourite Saying in the *Eaſt*)

The ſlothful hideth his hand in his *boſom:*
It grieveth him to bring it again to his mouth.

It is the opinion of ſome of the beſt commentators, both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian*, that the Wiſe Man here ſpeaks by way of hyperbole, or (in other words) that he charges the *ſluggard* with ſuch an inſtance of *ſloth*, as he can ſcarce be ſuppoſed guilty of even in his moſt idle moments. And this is a figure, much uſed by proverbial writers, as well ſacred, as prophane; who generally deliver their moral Sayings in the ſtrongeſt ſenſe they will bear, in order to render them the more ſtriking and affecting; and ſeem to delight in raiſing the attention, that they may thereby the better make way to the underſtanding.

But, in *our* tranſlation, this lively hyperbole is in a manner loſt. For to ſay, that *the ſlothful man hideth his hand in his boſom*, or (which is thought the ſame thing)

thing) *hideth it under his arm-pit*; *and will not earn his living*, (as the latter part of the Proverb is uſually interpreted) has nothing figurative or exaggerated, either in the ſentiment or the diction. Nay, if we compare what (according to this ſenſe) is here ſaid of the *ſluggard* with what is ſaid of him in other parts of this book; as, particularly, that *he roaſteth not that which he took in hunting*; that, upon any proſpect of buſineſs, he cries, *there is a lion without, I ſhall be ſlain in the ſtreets*; that, as *the door turneth upon his hinges, ſo doth he upon his bed*; and the like: I ſay, if we compare the words of the text (as our verſion repreſents them) with theſe ſtrong and elevated deſcriptions; we ſhall find them to be ſo far from *exceeding* the notion we are taught to have of the *ſluggard*, that they will appear to come *very ſhort* of it.

In order therefore to recover the force and ſpirit of this hyperbole, and to make it apppear (according to the deſign of the text) to what a ſurprizing degree of *idleneſs* men may, by indulging their eaſe, and neglecting their buſineſs, at length bring themſelves; I ſhall endeavour to give here the true and genuine meaning of this Proverb.

The chief difficulty of this paſſage ariſes from one ſingle word, and that is צלחת, *tſallachath*; which our tranſlators render *boſom*, perhaps in imitation of the LXX, who have κολπον αυτε. The ſame idea of this word is likewiſe given here in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* verſions, and by many modern interpreters. But this notion (as I obſerved before) does not come up to the

ſenſe

ſenſe of the place; the degree of *idleneſs* it repreſents being far inferior to what *Solomon* is ſuppoſed to have levelled his aphoriſm againſt. Nor is this the only objection, this interpretation is liable to. There is another, and much greater, ſtill behind; which is, that it is no more agreeable to the analogy of Scripture, than it is expreſſive of the full and juſt meaning of the Wiſe Man. The word *tſallachath* no where, as I can find, ſignifies *boſom* or *lap*. If therefore we have any regard to that excellent Rule of interpreting not only the Bible, but all other books whatſoever; namely, in caſes of difficulty, to have recourſe to parallel paſſages, and to endeavour to ſettle the meaning of a doubtful word or ſentence in one place, by it's known and allowed acceptation in another: if, I ſay, we have any regard to this excellent, this moſt uſeful Rule, and examine *tſallachath* by the ſignification it confeſſedly bears in other places; we ſhall find it neceſſary to ſet aſide the notion of *boſom*, or *lap*, which has ſo long prevailed; and look for ſome other, which ſhall be more conſonant to the uſage of Scripture in general, as well as more agreeable to the deſign of this particular text.

THE word is found in three other places beſides theſe in *Proverbs*, and but three. The firſt is 2 *Kings* II, 20: where *Eliſha*, being about to *heal* or purify the waters of *Jericho*, calls for a *tſallachath* (in our printed copies here צלחית) which our tranſlators render a *cruſe*, the Greek, υδρια, *a water-pot*; the other antient verſions, by words importing a *jarr*, *flagon*, *urn*, *pitcher*, &c. The ſecond place, where we meet with the word, is in the XXI chapter of the ſame ſecond book of *Kings*, ver. 13:

ver. 13: where the LORD, denouncing his judgments againſt *Jeruſalem* for the wickedneſs of king *Manaſſeh*, ſays, that *he will wipe her, as a man wipeth a* DISH, [*tſallachath*] *wiping it, and turning it upſide down.* For *upſide down*, the margin has, *upon the face thereof:* perhaps, it ſhould rather be, *upon it's mouth.*[a] The LXX for *diſh* have αλαβαστρος, a word well known in the New Teſtament. The third and laſt place, where this word is uſed, is 2 *Chron.* XXXV, 13; where, in the account of the ſolemn *Paſſover* kept by *Joſiah*, it is ſaid, that *the prieſts ſod the holy offerings in pots, and in caldrons, and in* [*tſallachoth*] which our tranſlators render *panns*, and the Vulgate *ollis*. Theſe are the only places, where we have any thing of this word, except in the book of *Proverbs*. And from theſe it appears that it's true and proper notion is that of a *diſh, platter, pot, pitcher, urn*, or ſome ſuch ſort of Veſſel, of ordinary uſe in domeſtic affairs; whether for ſerving meat up to the table, or holding other things.

THE ſame ſenſe therefore we may reaſonably ſuppoſe it has in the text: and that it has ſo, will appear further from the following authorities. The *Chaldee* paraphraſt renders it by the ſame word in the text, as he does in *Prov.* XXVI, 15. It is שתיתא; which, though by it's Latin tranſlator it is rendered *Aſcella*, in imitation of the *Vulgate*, is yet by the beſt judges agreed to ſignify a *diſh*, or *platter*.[b] And if from the paraphraſt

[a] *Ore deorſum verſo*, as *Grotius* explains it. And ſo על פני הבאר (2 *Sam.* XVII, 19) is *Over the well's mouth.*

[b] *Aſcella* is by Commentators taken for *Axilla*, the *arm-pit*; and they make the ſenſe to be, *he hideth his hand under his arm-pit,*

we deſcend to the Rabbinical expoſitors; we ſhall find them likewiſe declaring in favour of ſome ſuch ſort of *veſſel*: and, that they may not leave us in doubt what it is, one of them [a] expreſsly tells us that it is the ſame with *Eliſha*'s *cruſe*; and another, [b] that it is the ſame with the *pans*, in which the prieſts ſod the ſacrifice at *Joſiah*'s Paſſover. It is true indeed, that ſome few of them mention the other notion of *boſom*. But this they ſeem to do, rather becauſe they conceive the *hiding the hand in the boſom* to be agreeable to the attitude the *ſluggard* is uſually drawn in; than becauſe they think it the proper ſignification of the word, which they at the ſame time declare to be that of a *diſh* or *platter*. As if they thought that the *other* was only a metaphorical one; and that the word *tſallachath* could no otherwiſe be applied to the *boſom*, than as the *boſom* is *hollow* within, as the veſſel, we are contending for, is; and conſequently capable of *holding* the *lazy* hand, as that is of *containing* the *liquors*, *meats*, and other things, that are put therein.

HERE, then, we have the opinion of the *Jewiſh* commentators, added to the uſage of Scripture, for determining the ſenſe of the word *tſallachath*; on which, as I ſaid above, the meaning of the whole *Proverb* turns. And according to both theſe, the true and genuine ſig-

pit, or *ſtandeth with his arms acroſs*. But the word *Aſcella* being unknown, unleſs in the later Latin authors; and it being only uſed by them in the ſenſe of *Axilla*: may not this word have been *here* corrupted from *Scutella*, a *diſh* or *platter*? And the ſame ſenſe of *Scutella*, in the opinion of both *Buxtorf* and *Caſtell*, has the noun שחא as well as שחתא.

[a] *Aben-Ezra.* [b] *Levi Ben Gerſhom.*

nification

nification of it is that of a *pot*, *pan*, or *platter*, or ſome ſuch common piece of culinary furniture, made uſe of in families, as well for dreſſing their meats, as for diſhing them out after they are dreſſed.

NOR is this ſenſe unknown to *Chriſtian* expoſitors, (for I am not now advancing any thing new) but it has been mentioned by ſeveral of them as a very *probable* interpretation, and embraced by others (and thoſe the beſt judges) as the *true* one; and would, I am perſuaded, have been preferred by all, had it not been for an Objection, which I ſhall anſwer in the ſequel.

IN the mean time, it may not be amiſs, before I go any further, to obſerve, that though moſt of the *Jewiſh* interpreters agree in rendering the firſt part of the Proverb as I have done, [*The ſlothful man hideth his hand in the* DISH] yet they differ a little about the latter; one of them,* and that a man of great note, expounding it, not, as above, *He* WILL *not*, but, *he* SHALL *not, return his hand to his mouth.* And he adds the reaſon why; *Becauſe*, ſays he, *having neglected the means of getting a livelihood, he ſhall find nothing in the diſh to eat.* But this does not come up to the ſenſe of the Wiſe Man, who (as may be gathered from the XXVI chapter, where, as I ſaid, we have this Proverb again) is rather deſcribing the *degrees* of Idleneſs, than the *conſequences* of it; rather what the ſluggard *does*, than what he *ſuffers*. The words are ſtill more emphatical there, than here. They are, *The ſlothful man hideth*

* *Aben-Ezra.*

his hand in the DISH: *It* GRIEVETH *him to return it to his mouth.* The original word for *grieveth* is נלאה; which would be better rendered, *It is grievous* or *burthenſome to him*; or, as the *Greek*, *He cannot bear it*; or, as the word is elſewhere [a] tranſlated, *He loaths*, or *grudges to do it*; or, laſtly, as the *Targum* and *Vulgate*, *It is a labour to him:* and he hates all kind of labour, however eaſy, or even neceſſary. So that his *not returning his hand to his mouth is* not owing to the *emptineſs* of the *diſh*, but to the *ſluggiſhneſs* of the *perſon:* it is not becauſe he finds nothing there to eat, but becauſe he will not be at the pains to eat what he finds. Though he has his diet ready cooked up, and ſet before him; he is ſo liſtleſs and indolent, that he will not feed himſelf. To ſpeak in our vulgar proverb, he is no quicker at his *meat*, than he is at his *work:* nor will his hands ſerve him any more to *devour*, than to *earn* his food. *The roaſted thruſhes*, as the comic Poet expreſſes it in *Athenæus*, [b] *muſt come hot from the ſpit to his mouth, and importune him to eat them.*

I therefore prefer the opinion of the other *Jews*, who take no notice of the *emptineſs of the Diſh*; but render the clauſe as I have done, and impute the *ſluggard's not returning his hand to his mouth* rather to his want of will to help himſelf, than to his having nothing to eat. I will give you their meaning in the words following. *When the ſluggard*, ſays one of them, *has plunged his hand into the diſh for a morſel of meat*; *he is too idle to take it out again, and feed himſelf.* Another of them,

[a] *Exod.* VII, 18. [b] Lib. VI, Cap. 19.

having

having repreſented the *ſluggard* as *letting his hand lye in the diſh, as if the mouth of it was too narrow for him to draw it back again*, proceeds thus: *This*, ſays he, *gives us a true image of the drone in the text; who has his hands ſo tied and ſhackled by the tyranny of Sloth, that he has not power to diſengage them, and ſet about any work, though it be to ſupply himſelf with the neceſſaries of life, and keep himſelf from ſtarving.*[a]

THIS ſenſe of the word *tſallachath* contains a much ſtronger and livelier hyperbole, than the common one. And it would, no doubt, have been embraced not only by the *Jewiſh*, but the *Chriſtian* commentators likewiſe, as preferable to it; had they conceived it equally proper to ſucceed the verb טמן *taman:* which, ſignifying to *hide*, might have ſeemed to ſome more applicable to the *boſom* or *arm-pit*, than to a *diſh* or *platter*, which is generally too *flat* and *ſhallow* to *hide* the hand in. This is the Objection, which I hinted at above. But it may be eaſily anſwered, in the manner following.

1. THE account we have before given of the word *tſallachath* from the three other places of Scripture, is far from ſuppoſing the Veſſel ſignified by it, whatever it was, to be ſo *broad* and *flat* as our ordinary *diſhes* or *platters* are. For, not to mention the 2 chap. of the II book of *Kings*, where it denotes an *urn* or *water-pot*; nor the 35 of the II book of *Chron.* where it denotes a *pot* or *baſon:* I ſay, not to mention theſe two places, where

[a] See the Commentaries of *Aben-Ezra* and *L. Ben Gerſhom* on this Text, and on Chap. XXVI, 15.

the word evidently denotes a veſſel of ſome *inward capacity*; we may, I think, take it for certain, that it ſignifies ſomething of *depth* in the third likewiſe. For there our tranſlators render it *platter*; and the *wiping it*, and *turning it upon it's mouth*, are put (as all expoſitors agree) to repreſent the total *evacuation* and *demolition* of *Jeruſalem*. But this it could not well do; unleſs, like the παροψιδες, to which the *hearts* and *inward affections* of men are compared in the Goſpel, [a] it had it's το εσωθεν, ſome *room* or *capacity* in the *inſide*, to anſwer to the *inner* ſtreets and buildings of the city, which were to be *evacuated* and *demoliſhed*.

2. THE food of the antient *Hebrews*, conſiſting chiefly of liquids or ſpoon-meats, ſuch as *broths*, *pottages*, and the like, muſt be ſuppoſed to require *deeper* veſſels to ſerve it up to their families, than what are commonly in uſe among us, who live ſo much on fleſh-meats. And, as the *Eaſtern* nations are known to have been very tenacious of their old cuſtoms; the *tſallachath* in *Solomon*'s time, may have been the ſame with the τρυβλιον, [b] a veſſel of large content, in our *Saviour*'s: and *taman* here in the Proverbs may ſignify the ſame with the εμβαπτειν of the Goſpel. Nay, as theſe people adhere ſo cloſely to the ways of their fore-fathers; who knows but this noun may have ſignified the ſame with thoſe large *bowls*, or *pans*, out of which, as Travellers [c] inform us, the inhabitants of thoſe countries eat their *Pilloes*, or compoſitions of rice, &c. at this very day?

[a] *Matt.* XXIII, 25. [b] *Matt.* XXVI, 23. [c] *Thevenot*, par. I, ch. 24; and *Shaw*, p. 297: the latter of whom tells us, that theſe people *dip* their fingers into the *diſh* or *bowl*; and take out the meat, mouthful after mouthful.

The

The *Arabic* will ſupport this idea of the noun צלחת: for in that language (with the commutable letter *Za* for *Sâd*) the noun صلح ſignifies *catini magni, paropſides grandiores*, &c.

3. If it ſhould be thought, there is any difficulty ſtill remaining with regard to the verb *taman*; it may be readily removed by ſuppoſing that the word might have had ſome ſuch ſignification in *Hebrew*, as it has ſtill in *Arabic*: which is not only to *put*, or *thruſt in*, but alſo to *fix for a continuance*, to *reſt*, or *repoſe*. And this ſignification is very ſuitable to the *Sluggard*, who is the ſubject of the *Proverb*; for, though he may be ready, when hunger prompts him, to *thruſt his hand into the diſh*, there he *lets it lye*, nor will he *be at the pains to return it to his mouth*.

To all which it muſt be added, as of great importance; that the word *tſallachath* has no manner of *ſuffix* either here, or in the XXVI chapter, which can give ground for the pronoun *his* before *boſom*: which yet cannot well be ſpared out of the common Tranſlations; but is of no uſe to what I now ſubmit to the conſideration of the Learned.

And I ſhall therefore conclude theſe remarks, in the ſame-manner as before, with the Original Words, and what I apprehend to be the proper Tranſlation of them.

טמן עצל ידו בצלחת
גם אל פיהו לא ישיבנה׃

A ſlothful man hideth his hand in the diſh;
Even to his own mouth he will not return it.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXIV, 27.

הכן בחוץ מלאכתך ועתדה בשדה לך
אחר ובנית ביתך׃

Prepare thy work without, and make it fit for thyſelf in the field:
And afterwards build thine houſe.

THESE two Hemiſtichs are uſually divided at the word לך; and the *Vau*, prefixed to בנית, is carried back, and rendered as if prefixed to אחר: as here in our Tranſlation. Otherwiſe, it would not be, *And afterwards*, as we have it, but *Afterwards and:* which is a harſh and unnatural conſtruction. To avoid it, what if we divide the Verſe at בשדה; and conſider לך, not as a *Pronoun* of the Dative caſe, but (agreeably to the *Greek* and *Arabic* verſions) as a *Verb* of the Imperative mood: as, bating the Vowels, on which we lay no ſtreſs, it often is? The Senſe will then run off eaſily, in the manner following.

הכן בחוץ מלאכתך
ועתדה בשדה
לך אחר ובנית ביתך׃

Prepare thy work without;
And fit it up in the field:
Go afterwards, and build thine houſe.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXV, 13.

כצנת שלג ביום קציר
ציר נאמן לשלחיו ונפש אדניו ישיב׃

As the cold of ſnow in the time of harveſt:
So is a faithful meſſenger to them that ſend him; for he refreſheth the ſoul of his maſters.

THERE is ſome variety of opinions among the Expoſitors, concerning the Meaning of the firſt word צנת. *Aben-Ezra* takes it in the moſt uſual ſignification, that of a *Shield*; and ſays, that *Snow* may be ſo called from it's being a *Protection*, or *Defence* to a man againſt the violence of the Summer Heats. But a *Shield of Snow* is a hard expreſſion. The *Greek* has ἐξοδος, and the *Syriac* ܢܚܬ, *deſcendit:* for what reaſon, it is difficult to gueſs; unleſs the authors of theſe tranſlations had regard rather to what they thought to be the ſenſe of the place, than to the literal ſignification of the word; or unleſs they took their notion of צנת from ſome old *Hebrew* root, of the ſame import with the *Arabic* ذن, *ſenſim fluxit*, or with سن, *leniter effudit*. But could theſe Verſions be more eaſily accounted for, than they are; the ſenſe, they offer, would ſcarce be proper here. For *Snow* does not often *fall* in *Summer*;

or,

or, if it does ſometimes happen to *fall* at that time, it is ſo far from being acceptable, as the *Snow* in the Text is repreſented to be, that it is rather looked upon as a very unſeaſonable and unpleaſant thing: as appears from the compariſon in the very firſt verſe of the next chapter. [a] The *Targum*, our *Engliſh*, and ſome other verſions have *Cold*. And no doubt but it is that quality, which renders *Snow* agreeable in the Summer. But I cannot find that the word צנה ſignifies *Cold*, in any other place; and in this before us it ſeems to imply a great deal more.

To underſtand it's full import, we are to recollect, what we are often told by Travellers, that the inhabitants of the hot Climates of the Eaſt, who make uſe of *Snow* to cool and dilute their Liquors in the Summer ſeaſon, have their مثلجات, or *Snow-Houſes*; which are certain underground Vaults or Cellars, where they lay up vaſt quantities of it either in earthern Veſſels, or cloſe-wrought Baſkets, to be kept the Year round: as well for ſale, as for their own private Uſe. [b] And why

[a] See a learned and uſeful Book publiſhed a few years ago, under the title of, *Obſervations on divers paſſages of Scripture; taken from Voyages and Travels into the* Eaſt: p. 197.

[b] Theſe Liquors are ſold in their great *Batzars*, where they have Baſkets full of Ice and Snow all the Summer long, whereof they put ſo much into their Drink, that it maketh their Teeth chatter and quake again. *Rauwolff*'s Travels; p. 95: in *Ray*'s Collection. See alſo Bp *Pococke*'s Travels, Vol. II. Part I. p. 125.

I have been told by a Native of the Country, that the name, by which they now call the Veſſel, out of which they retail their Snow, is خابية, a *But*, *Pipe*, or *Jarr*: from خبا, *recondidit*.

may

may not צנת be here put to ſignify ſome ſuch Veſſel? We have authority from Scripture, to think it is; though the word is commonly looked upon as one of the απαξ λεγομενα. In *Exodus* XVI, 33; צנצנת, which is only צנת doubled, is the *Pot*,[a] or *Urn*, in which *Moſes* ordered *Aaron* to lay up the Omer of *Manna* before the LORD, to be kept to future generations, in teſtimony of that Miracle. Now it is a known rule in the Eaſtern tongues, that ſuch *reduplicated* words generally follow the ſignification of their *ſimples*. As therefore צנצנת appears to be a *Pot*, or *Urn*; moſt probably צנת is ſo too. Again, as מ and ץ are commutable letters, we have another place that may aſſiſt us in making out the notion of this word; and that is *Deut.* XXVI, 2: where the *Baſket*, in which the *Iſraelites* were to offer up the Firſt-fruits of the Earth, on their arrival at the land of Promiſe, is called טנא: which word we have again Chap. XXVIII, 5 joined with משארת, *Store*: *Bleſſed ſhall be thy baſket and thy ſtore*. To theſe authorities from the *Hebrew* may be added many more from the *Arabic*; in which language صن, according to *Golius*, is *Fiſcella plicatilis*: and, agreeably to this ſenſe, it is put by the *Arabic* Tranſlator (2 *Cor.* XI, 33) to expreſs the Σαργανη, or *Baſket*, in which St. *Paul* was let down by the Wall at *Damaſcus*. And of the ſame import is صنة, which is our צנת to a letter; and it is uſed in *Haggai* (II, 16) for a *Heap*, or *Repoſitory* of Corn: where the *Greek* verſion is Κυφελη. And صنان is a *Pot*, *Pan*, or *Caniſter*; as may be ſeen *Exod.* XXVII, 3; and XXXVIII, 3. I might likewiſe mention صان *repoſuit*, *recondidit*;

[a] *Jarchi* expounds it by צלחית; concerning which, ſee above, p. 70.

from whence we have صوان *repoſitorium*; but I ſubmit it to the judgment of the Reader, whether what has been already offered will not aſſiſt him in recovering, and, in ſome meaſure, fixing the meaning of the doubtful word צנת, which he will now perhaps have found to ſignify a *Pot*, or *Baſket*, or ſome other ſuch veſſel; wherein things were laid up in ſtore, and kept till occaſion called for them.

And now to apply theſe obſervations: the Treaſure of Refreſhment in the *Snow* anſwers to the Stock of Fidelity in the *Meſſenger*. The thirſty Drinker is not more certainly exhilarated by the *Coolneſs* of the One, than the expecting Maſter is by the *Punctuality* of the Other. And herein ſeems to lie the Correſpondence of the reſpective parts of this Aphoriſm. Subſtitute therefore the word *Veſſel*, in the room of the word *Cold* (for which there does not ſeem to be in *Hebrew* the leaſt foundation) and the Sentence will be as follows.

כצנת שלג ביום קציר
ציר נאמן לשלחיו
ונפש אדניו ישיב׃

As a veſſel of ſnow, in the time of harveſt;
So is a truſty meſſenger to them that ſend him:
For he reviveth the ſpirit of his maſters.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXV, 23.

רוח צפון תחולל גשם
ופנים נזעמים לשון סתר׃

The north-wind driveth away rain:
So doth an angry countenance a backbiting tongue.

THE marginal reading, inſtead of the *north-wind driveth away rain*, has *the north-wind bringeth forth rain*; in a very different and quite oppoſite ſenſe. And it muſt be confeſſed, that the verb is frequently uſed by the Sacred Writers in the notion of *bringing forth*; but perhaps never in the notion of *driving away*: which would at once incline one to prefer the marginal ſenſe. And the reaſon, why our Tranſlators did not, ſeems to have been; becauſe they could not conceive, how *Solomon* could ſpeak of a *rainy* wind, as blowing from the *North*. They were therefore led to interpret the verb in a ſenſe, which is no where warranted by Scripture; and which has coſt the Commentators a great deal of fruitleſs pains to make out, as may be ſeen in their notes upon this paſſage.

BUT, as to the North-wind; though in it's *direct* way to *Jeruſalem* it paſſes over a large tract of land, it alſo paſſes over a great part of the *Euxine* Sea. And, if that Sea ſhould be thought too remote; we may take this wind a little to the *Weſt*: as the Sacred Writers, having few or no intermediate points, might call that *North*, which was only *Northward*. In this manner will the wind, in it's paſſage, bruſh along the ſkirts of the *Mediterranean*; and may, by dipping it's wings in that Sea, collect a ſufficient quantity of Rain, whereby to water the fields of *all Judea*: and indeed the more *Weſterly* parts of *Judea* might be watered from this Sea, if the wind blew directly from the North. The preceding idea of the *North*, or *North-Weſterly* wind bringing Vapours from the *Mediterranean*, ſeems ſtrongly confirmed by an antient *Jewiſh* writer, of good authority;[a] whoſe words are theſe: כמו הרוח הצפונות חברא הנשם בירושלם כי היא תביא שם האידים העולים מהים כי הים הוא צפוני לה כן לשון סתר שיספר אדם לחבירו רכילות יברא פנים נזעמים ויחדשם: — *As the North-wind produces Rain at* Jeruſalem, *whither it brings the vapours ariſing from the Sea, I mean the Sea lying north-ward of it* (the City): *ſo a backbiting Tongue, which carries ſcandalous ſtories from one man to another, produces Countenances full of anger and reſentment.* Where, by Sea, I take it for granted he means the *Mediterranean*; which is called in *Hebrew*, by way of emphaſis, הים, *The Sea.*

[a] *Levi Ben Gerſhom.*

THE

THE objection to the marginal ſenſe, taken from the ſuppoſed dryneſs and ſerenity of the Northern region, will alſo vaniſh; if by the North-wind we underſtand, not any one particular wind, but *the wind* in general. Thus the words *aquilo* and *boreas* frequently ſignify in *poetical* language: and that theſe Proverbs are written in Poetry, is affirmed by the beſt Criticks.* But there is another obſervation to be made on צפון (the original of the word for North-wind) on account of it's particular connection in this verſe. For as that word, which is in the firſt Hemiſtich, ſignifies *abſconditus*; and exactly anſwers to סתר in the ſecond Hemiſtich; it is not at all unlikely, from the turn of the Proverb, that a compariſon is here meant between *ſecret wind* and *ſecret calumny*: and the following is the image, which this ſimilitude gives us. *As the Wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but knoweſt not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth*: ſo it is with *ſecret Calumny*; it roveth up and down with great freedom, though inviſible; and thou heareſt the voice of it, but knoweſt not *from whence it cometh*, who ſet it firſt on foot; or *whither it goeth*, who will help it on it's journey, and ſupply it with freſh matter for it's future ſubſiſtence.

BUT, notwithſtanding the evident alluſion in theſe two words to each other in the original; yet as the

* See *De Sacra Poeſi Hebræorum, Prælect.* 24; where the very learned Author ſays: *Ex hoc genere Didactico multa ſuperſunt Hebrææ Poeſeos monumenta; in quibus principem locum facile obtinent Parabolæ Salomonis.*

objections

objections to the *humidity* of the North-wind have been removed: it may be preferable to render the firſt Hemiſtich here, *The North-wind bringeth forth rain.* Agreeably to which the Septuagint Verſion has, *raiſeth up rain*; the Syriac, *is pregnant with rain*; the Greek of Aquila, *labours to bring forth rain:* and to the ſame purpoſe *Junius*, with ſeveral other modern interpreters.[a]

As the marginal tranſlation ſeems to be right, in the former part of this Proverb; ſo does it likewiſe in the *latter:* where, though no alteration is made in the *Senſe* of the words, the *Order* of them is inverted. For, inſtead of reading (according to the textual interpretation) *So doth an angry countenance a backbiting tongue*; it reads, *So doth a backbiting tongue an angry countenance.*[b]

[a] Thus the learned father *Houbigant*, on this place, ſays —— *Inſiſtendum in ſignificatu frequentiſſimo* parere, gignere. *Ventus* Aquilo *idem ac Ventus inter Aquilonem flans & Occidentem, qui* Caurus *appellari ſolet: nam carent Hebræi nominibus iis, quæ minores ventos ſignificent. Imminet Judææ mare* Mediterraneum, *ex ea plaga unde flant* Cauri; *ut non mirum ſit, eos ventos advehere imbres in Judæam.*

[b] The *Greek* Verſion of this laſt Hemiſtich is, Προσωπον δε ανωιδες γλωσσαν ερεθιζει: which differs from both the above renderings. The firſt thing obſervable in it is, that there is nothing to anſwer to סתר but ερεθιζει: but how the *Greek* Tranſlators could take that word verbally, is hard to gueſs. Unleſs they conceived it to be equivalent to the *Chaldee* verb סתר; which, according to *Caſtell*, ſignifies, among other things, *contradicere, oppugnare*, &c. Or, unleſs they met with ſome antient *Hebrew* verb, in uſe in their days, of the ſame ſignification with the preſent *Arabic* شتر, *detraxit, obtrectavit, contumelia affecit.* On either of theſe ſuppoſitions, the reaſon of their ερεθιζει is apparent. Nor can their rendering נזעמים by ανωιδες, *inverecundum*, perhaps be better accounted for,

BUT there are ſtill ſome expreſſions, in both parts of this inſtructive Aphoriſm, which require further illuſtration; and remarks upon them ſhall be offered in the following order:

I. THE *Hebrew* word, here rendered *Tongue*, often ſignifies in Scripture, not only the *Inſtrument* of ſpeech commonly known by that name, but likewiſe *Speech* itſelf; and particularly that ſort of ſpeech, which men employ in traducing and vilifying one another. How the tongue came to have ſo bad a notion affixed to it by the Sacred Writers; whether, becauſe in judicial proceedings we make uſe of it to accuſe our neighbour; or whether, becauſe in common converſation we are apt to exerciſe it to the prejudice of his good name: I ſhall not now enquire. However, certain it is, that in Scripture-language the word *tongue* is but another term for *ſlander* or *calumny*; and often ſtands for *evil-ſpeaking*, without the addition of the epithet *evil*. Thus, *Pſ.* CXL, 11; what is in the Hebrew *a man of tongue* is by our tranſlators rendered an *evil-ſpeaker*. And ſo, *Eccl.* X, 11; what is literally *the maſter of the tongue*, is by the *Chaldee*-paraphraſt and other good tranſlators rendered a *ſlanderer* or *ſycophant*; and the ſimilitude of a *biting ſerpent*, which immediately precedes, juſtifies this ſenſe. And ſo again, *Ezek.* XXXVI, 3; the Prophet tells his captive countrymen, that they *were*

for, than by ſuppoſing they underſtood the verb לעם in the ſenſe of the *Arabic* لعم, *prætendit, attribuit ſibi*; or elſe in the ſenſe of the *Syriac* ܠܥܨ, *irriſio, ſubſannatio*.

taken

taken up on the lip of the tongue, i. e. were become a *by-word* and a *reproach* among their enemies, the *Idumeans*; for thus the next words imply, *And ye are the infamy of the people.* And as the holy Penmen made uſe of the noun to denote *calumny* and *defamation*; ſo they formed a verb from it, which ſignifies to *calumniate* and *defame.* Thus, *Pſ.* CI, 5; the words, which we render, *whoſo privily ſlandereth his neighbour*, ſignify literally, *whoſo uſeth his tongue againſt his neighbour in ſecret.* And, *Prov.* XXX, 10; the precept, *Accuſe not a ſervant unto his maſter*, is in the original, *Uſe not thy tongue againſt a ſervant:* or, as it is in the margin, *Hurt not a ſervant with thy tongue* — where I am forced to throw in the word *uſe*, as the margin does *hurt*, becauſe we have no one word in our language, which will expreſs the force of the *Hebrew* verb. From all which paſſages it is plain, that the word *tongue* in the text, which ſeems to ſtand for the *organ* of ſpeech, is to be taken for the *faculty* itſelf; and denotes that flagitious, though common abuſe of it, whereby we injure the reputation or good name of our neighbour; and which in ordinary diſcourſe we call *ſlander*, *calumny*, *detraction*, or by ſome other name of the like import. And that this is the proper notion of *tongue* in this Aphoriſm, may further appear from the word *ſecret* joined with it; for to ſay a *ſecret tongue*, or, as it is in the original, *a tongue of ſecreſy*, is a very indeterminate expreſſion, and may be taken either in a *good*, or *bad* ſenſe; and therefore our tranſlators, in order to avoid the ambiguity, have taken it in the bad ſenſe, and rendered it *backbiting tongue.* Whereas, had they attended to the notion, in which I have ſhewn the word to be often

often uſed in Scripture; and by *tongue* underſtood not the *inſtrument* of ſpeech, but the abuſe of it, which we call *evil-ſpeaking*; they might have retained the term *ſecret*: becauſe *ſecret ſcandal*, or *ſecret calumny*, is a thing ſo common in practice, that no one is a ſtranger to the name, and ſcarce any one to it's true meaning.

If we examine into many of the ſtories, which affect our neighbour's reputation; and trace them back through the ſeveral ſtages, through which they have paſſed; we ſhall find ſome of them to have been ſo very *obſcure* at their firſt ſetting out, that one would wonder how they ever got ground, or obtained that currency they have met with in the world. A very trivial circumſtance, the moſt diſtant ſuggeſtion, even a whiſper, a doubtful expreſſion, a ſmile, a nod, a mere ſurmiſe, ſilence itſelf; nay (where the thing has been canvaſſed over in converſation) the very manner of denying it, or even affirming the contrary, has given ſtrength to many a malicious report, which has afterwards ſpread far and wide, and been the occaſion of a great deal of miſchief. The misfortune is, there is ſuch a propenſity in mankind to hear and relate ill-natured things one of another; that ſuch a report no ſooner makes it's appearance, than there are numbers of people ready to help it out of it's *obſcurity*, and to recommend it to common vogue. At it's firſt emerging, indeed, it may, conſcious of it's dark origin, look a little out of countenance, and betray ſome diffidence of ſucceſs; but, by degrees, it acquires courage, aſſumes an air of probability, and endeavours to paſs itſelf on us for real truth.

II. As Calumny is born in the *dark*, it works in the *dark*; *obſcurity* is natural to it, and it delights in being *obſcure*. It is a common obſervation, that a *ſcandalous ſtory*, when it once takes air, and becomes the topic of converſation, is generally laſt known to him, who is moſt affected by it. Thoſe, who hear it, have either *too much* reſpect for him, to appriſe him of it, or *too little*: the former forbear to do it, for fear of giving him uneaſineſs; the latter, for fear of giving him an opportunity to clear himſelf. Thus, through the cruel tenderneſs of his friends, on the one ſide, and the malicious activity of his enemies, on the other, the infamy ſpreads without controul; every thing is thought of to heighten the ſuſpicion, and nothing to abate it: the unhappy ſufferer, remaining a ſtranger to his own caſe, diſcovers no inclination to ſet matters right; his ſilence is interpreted conſent; and his very ignorance of what common fame alledges againſt him, is made an argument that he is guilty of it.

And where then is the wonder, that *Calumny* is in the text called *ſecret*? It is of *ſecret origin*; often owing it's exiſtence to ſome *obſcure* circumſtance, or *remote* ſuſpicion, which the fertile invention of malice and ill-nature quickly improves into a very plauſible and circumſtantial tale. It is likewiſe of *ſecret operation*; exerting itſelf in ſuch a *covert* and *clandeſtine* manner, that it ſeldom comes to the knowledge of the perſon who is the ſubject of it, 'till it has ruined his reputation; his friends being too civil, and his enemies to cruel, to let him know what he ſuffers: the ſtory

all

all the while gathering ground, and taking advantage of his ignorance to rob him of his good name.

III. The first part of the comparison, in the text, is between the *north-wind*, or *wind in general*, or (as the epithet often signifies, and the turn of the words here seems to require) *secret Wind*, and *secret Calumny*. But the image, which this similitude gives us of *secret Calumny*, has been explained already. The other part of the comparison is between *Rain* and *Angry Looks*. And as the former part gave a very lively notion of the *active nature of secret Calumny*, so this latter part gives as lively a notion of the *mischievous effects of it*. The word here rendered *rain* (as is observed by a learned *Jewish* Writer[a]) denotes such a degree of that watry meteor, as is attended with *violence*, and signifies a *storm*: and the word rendered *angry* denotes such a degree of that passion, as is accompanied with *heat* and *fury*, and is commonly expressed in our *English* Bible by *indignation*. This *violent rain* is said to be *brought forth*, or (as the word may be rendered) *conceived*, *engendered*, *formed*, by the *wind*; as the *raging looks* (with which it is compared) are by *secret Calumny*. And the picture, which this part of the comparison gives us of the vice in the text, is this. As the *wind*, in passing over a large tract of land, or space of Sea, collects a multitude of thick vapours and foul exhalations; which, afterwards forming themselves into clouds, and obscuring the face of the heavens, fall to the earth

[a] *Kimchi:* who in his Lexicon explains it by גשם קשה, *a hard, or violent rain.*

with great noiſe and precipitancy. So it fares with *ſecret Calumny:* when it is once put in motion, (and a very ſmall thing does it) it takes a large circuit; and, picking up a variety of malicious ſtories and aggravating circumſtances, gradually forms a dreadful appearance of *angry looks* and *threatning countenances*, in the many perſons who may be hurt by the progreſſive and accumulated Scandal.

The two words, now rendered *angry countenance*, are plural. And ſince פנים, though often ſignifying ſingularly, as having no ſingular number, may be, and ſometimes is, rendered *faces* or *countenances*; this Proverb more naturally requires a plural ſignification. The *extenſive* nature of the *Miſchief* thus occaſioned, may poſſibly be united with the *active* nature of this *Sin*, in forming the reaſon, why a Calumniator is called in the *Chaldee a man with a three-fold*, or *three-forked*, tongue; as he is in the *Targum* on *Pſ.* CXL, 11; and in that on *Eccleſ.* X, 11. And, in *Eccleſiaſticus* XXVIII; 14, 15; what in the *Engliſh* verſion is *a backbiting tongue*, is in the *Greek* γλωσσα τριτη. And this expreſſion of the *triple* tongue perfectly agrees with *Virgil*'s expreſſion, in deſcribing the Serpent; *Georgic.* III. 439.

——*linguis micat ore triſulcis.*[*]

[*] *Ruæus*, in his Note on this place, ſays: *Ariſtoteles Serpentum linguam agnoſcit longam ac* BIFIDAM; *Poetæ* TRIFIDAM: *ſive quod, in modum cuſpidis conformata, triplex habeat acumen; ſive quod ita vibretur celeriter, ut non tantum biſida ſed triplex etiam appareat: unde* Ovid. *Met.* III. 9. *Treſque micant linguæ.* Thus *Ruæus*. And what renders the deſcription of the Serpent, here given by *Virgil*, remarkably pertinent to our preſent purpoſe is, that

BUT though *angry Countenances*, and thoſe in great abundance, ſeem included by *Solomon*; yet he does not mean to confine the effects of anger, occaſioned by a ſcandalous tongue, to the Looks only. But he gives us the external mark of this paſſion, in order to introduce the beautiful compariſon in the Text; and then, from what *appears* without, leaves us to collect what is *felt* within. The Looks of men are the indexes and interpreters of their Minds; and where theſe are ruffled and diſcompoſed, thoſe are not undiſturbed. The paſſion of *Anger*, in particular, is ſo viſibly legible in the Countenance, that in the *Hebrew* language one of the moſt conſiderable features of the human face is thought to receive it's denomination from thence. And perhaps the characters, which this paſſion imprints on the Aſpect, may be ſtill the ſtronger, where it is excited by the provocation of a ſcandalous tongue. For ſuch an attack, coming on a perſon on a ſudden and wounding him in the moſt ſenſible part, his good name, throws him off his guard; occaſioning ſuch a hurry in his blood and ſpirits, and conſequently ſuch a change in his Viſage and Behaviour, as prudence and the ſober dictates of reaſon (had he time to recollect himſelf) would in a great meaſure prevent, or at leaſt endeavour to conceal.

SO that by *angry looks*, which the Text ſays are *brought forth* by *ſecret calumny*, are meant not only

that the *Slanderer*, or, as the *Chaldee* paraphraſt ſtiles him, the *man with a triple tongue*, is expreſsly compared to this animal, *Eccleſ.* X, 11; as we have ſeen above, pag. 87.

the

the *ſuperficial* marks of Anger, which glow in the countenance, or contract the brow, (for theſe would give us but a very partial and inadequate notion of this pernicious vice) but likewiſe the internal commotions and perturbations, which agitate the breaſt, and are wont to break out in torrents of opprobrious language, or acts of violence; in threatnings, fightings, tumults, murders; and all that infernal train of diſorders and calamities, which both hiſtory and our own obſervation may inform us are ſometimes the effects of the unwarrantable liberties which men take with the characters of their neighbours. Juſt as, in the other part of the *compariſon*, by the word *rain* are intimated not only the droppings of a watry cloud, but likewiſe the floods and inundations occaſioned by the opening the bottles of heaven; which ſometimes deſtroy the fruits of the earth, and ſweep away the inhabitants thereof.

THESE are the miſchiefs, which the reporter of ſecret Calumny draws on Society. The *angry looks*, which his tongue raiſes in the faces of men, indicate angry minds; and are fitly compared to the *ſtorms* and tempeſts, which the *winds* raiſe in the face of the heavens; the diſorders and confuſions, which *theſe* produce in the *natural* world, bearing a near reſemblance to the diſorders and confuſions, which thoſe produce in the *moral*. In ſhort: as Calumny gets ground, the number of angry countenances muſt increaſe. Two or three may ſoon become a thouſand. And the hoſtile menaces, which at firſt lowered on the brows of a few individuals, or a ſmall party of men, have often diffuſed their malignant influence over the faces of multitudes; and at length

length endangered, nay, often deſtroyed the peace of a whole Community. *So great a matter a little fire kindleth!* or (to ſpeak in the different, though perhaps no leſs expreſſive metaphor of the text) *ſo dreadful a tempeſt is raiſed by the breath of a ſingle wind!* Though the cloud, at it's firſt appearance, be little, *as a man's hand*, it ſoon overſpreads the ſky; *the heavens are black with clouds and wind, and there is a great rain!* But the pernicious effects of *Secret Calumny* cannot be more emphatically deſcribed, than they are in the following very beautiful words of the *Son of Sirach*, which are contained in the 28th chapter before quoted,

14. A backbiting [*triple*] tongue hath diſquieted many,
and driven them from nation to nation:
ſtrong cities hath it pulled down,
and overthrown the houſes of great men.

15. A backbiting [*triple*] tongue hath caſt out virtuous women;
and deprived them of their labours.

16. Whoſo hearkneth unto it, ſhall never find reſt;
and never dwell quietly.

17. The ſtroke of the whip maketh marks in the fleſh;
but the ſtroke of the tongue breaketh the bones.

18. Many have fallen by the edge of the ſword;
but not ſo many, as have fallen by the tongue.

19. Well is he, that is defended from it;
and hath not paſſed through the venom thereof:
[*and hath not paſſed by, during it's rage:*]
who hath not drawn the yoke thereof,
nor hath been bound in her bands.

20. For the yoke thereof is a yoke of iron;
and the bands thereof are bands of braſs.

21. The death thereof [*therefrom*] is an evil death;
the grave were better than it.

22. It

22. It ſhall not have rule over them, that fear GOD;
neither ſhall they be burnt with the flame thereof.

23. Such, as forſake the LORD, ſhall fall into it;
and it ſhall burn in [*among*] them, and not be quenched:
it ſhall be ſent upon them as a lion;
and devour them as a leopard.

24. Look that thou hedge thy poſſeſſion about with thorns;
and bind up thy ſilver and gold.

25. And weigh thy words in a balance;
and make a door and bar for thy mouth.

26. Beware thou ſlide not by [*by means of*] it;
leſt thou fall before him, that lieth in wait.

IN conſequence of the ſeveral remarks thus offered, on the Proverb here explained; the true tranſlation, if we only add the regular copulative *and* inſtead of *ſo*, is probably the following.

רוח צפון תחולל גשם
ופנים נזעמים לשון סתר׃

The north-wind bringeth forth rain;
And a ſecret tongue angry countenances.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXV, 26.

מעין נרפש ומקור משחת
צדיק מט לפני רשע׃

A righteous man falling down before the wicked,
Is as *a troubled fountain, and a corrupt ſpring.*

THE harmony of theſe two Hemiſtichs is not clear in this Tranſlation; the notion of *falling down*, in the firſt, not entirely agreeing with that of *pollution* or *corruption*, in the ſecond. The connexion will be more viſible; if, inſtead of *falling down*, we borrow another ſignification of the verb מוט, from the *Arabic* مال: which not only imports, in general, *to be moved, drawn aſide*, or *thrown down*, as the *Hebrew* does; but alſo, more particularly, *to go aſide from what is right, to be unjuſt in judgment, to diſturb another in the enjoyment of any common privilege*; and the like. Whenever a *righteous man* behaves in ſuch a manner as this, (and in ſuch a manner as this [a] *Moſes* himſelf has told us that even the צדיקים *may* behave;) whenever he is prevailed upon, either through the Favours or the Frowns of a

[a] *Deut.* XVI, 19.

Wicked Perſon, thus to proſtitute his Integrity, and confound the Rules of Right and Wrong: he very juſtly falls under the compariſon of the Wiſe Man. For, inſtead of being, what he pretends to be, the Source of Juſtice, and the Oracle of Truth; he is like a *Fountain*, whoſe Sides are ſo trodden down, and Waters diſturbed by Mud and Dirt, that it is no longer capable of refreſhing thoſe who reſort to it, but is, on the contrary, become offenſive and loathſome.

THE LXX, for נרפש *trampled under foot* or *polluted*, have φραττοι, *ſtoppeth up*. Perhaps they contented themſelves with expreſſing the *Senſe*; as the defiling a ſpring with filth is in effect ſtopping it up. In *Arabic* the verb رفس ſignifies *pede percuſſit* and *complicato pede ligavit*; and the verb ريس ſignifies *implevit*, *plenum confertumque fuit*: the former of which verbs will aſſiſt us, in diſcovering the idea of the Greek Tranſlators; though not ſo exactly as the latter verb, which (with one commutable letter for another) may be conſidered as the ſame word; or it might have been the very ſame word, נרבש, at the time of making the Greek Verſion.

IT only remains to obſerve; that it is impoſſible to expreſs this and other ſimilar Verſes, without ſome particle indicating *Likeneſs*: ſuch as the particle ו *and*, or כן *ſo*. Vatablus, on the 9th verſe of the next chapter, ſays: *Similitudinis adverbium frequentiſſimè ab Hebræis ſubauditur*; *et* ו, *ſecundo loco poſitum*, *pro* ſic *accipitur*, *maximè in his Proverbiis*. But as כן *ſic* is the very particle often uſed in other Proverbs; and is here expreſſed

preſſed in the *Greek*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* Verſions: on theſe authorities, together with the preſent inequality of theſe two Hemiſtichs, I ſuppoſe this to have been the particle here expreſſed originally. And now, taking the two Hemiſtichs, not inverted as in our preſent *Engliſh* Verſion, but as they ſtand in the *Hebrew* Text; we may expreſs them thus.

מעין נרפש ומקור משחת
צדיק מט לפני רשע:

A troubled fountain, and a corrupted ſpring;
So is the righteous man, ſwerving from juſtice, in preſence of the wicked.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVI, 7.

דליו שקים מפסח
ומשל בפי כסילים׃

The legs of the lame are not equal:
So is *a parable in the mouth of fools.*

THE two parts of this Proverb have, in the Original, but one verb between them; and conſequently the ſettling the meaning of that verb will go a great way towards our ſettling the meaning of the whole Proverb. The verb is דלין; which ſome, deriving it from דלה *to draw water*, render, as our Tranſlators do, *are not equal — the legs of the lame are not equal*; going up and down alternately, like the two buckets of a well: a fit emblem, ſay they, of the hobbling and tottering gait of the *lame* man. And then, to apply this notion of *Inequality* to the latter part of the Compariſon, they add, that a *Parable* may be ſaid to be *unequal* in the mouth of Fools, becauſe the Speech of Fools is inconſiſtent; ſometimes good, and ſometimes bad; halting, as it were, between what is right and what is wrong: as the *Iſraelites* are ſaid (1 *Kings* XVIII, 21) *to halt* (the very word here made uſe of for *lame*)

between

between two opinions; inclining one while to the worſhip of GOD, and another to the worſhip of *Baal*. This is the way which thoſe, who render the verb דלין by *are unequal*, uſually take to connect the two parts of the Aphoriſm.

BUT I think, they underſtand the verb in too figurative and forced a ſenſe. There is another way of making out the coherence, which ſeems more plain and eaſy; and that is, by taking דלה in the ſenſe of דל *to be weak, feeble, diſabled, infirm* &c. Theſe two ſorts of irregular verbs often exchange ſenſes with each other: as may be ſeen in רב and רבה *to be multiplied*; קל and קלה *to be light* or *vile*; and others. And that *Symmachus* thus conſidered the verb in this Proverb, is plain from his rendering it by ἐξελιπον—*the legs fail* or *falter*. The generality of Interpreters ſay, *the legs* OF *the lame*; rendering the word מפסח in the genitive caſe, of which they will have the prefixed מ to be the ſign. But I do not take it to be ſo: eſpecially, as the word שקים *legs*, joined with it, muſt then have been (what the Grammarians call) *in regimen*; which it evidently is not. I therefore conſider the letter מ as a Prepoſition, denoting the *cauſe* of the *halting* or *failing* of the legs: and I underſtand פסח, not perſonally of the *lame man*; but of the thing, the *infirmity* or *lameneſs*; as the very ſame word فسخ, from فسخ to *be bruiſed* or *out of joint*, in the *Arabic* language ſtill ſignifies. *

* This ſame ſenſe is given of this clauſe in an anonymous *Arabic* Tranſlation of the book of Proverbs, never yet printed; a copy of which is preſerved in the *Bodleian* Library, among *Pococke*'s MSS, numb. 285. The words of it are, ضعفت الساقين من الزمن.

And now the Reader, I preſume, has already prevented me in making the application to the latter Hemiſtich. — Put a *Parable*, the Saying of a Wiſe Man, one of the Maxims of the Philoſophers, into the mouth of a *Fool*; and ſee what uſe he will make of it! It will be of no more ſervice to him in the Conduct of his Life, than *Legs* are to a *Cripple*. He has indeed the words; but he knows neither the meaning of them, nor how to apply them.

דליו שקים מפסח
ומשל בפי כסילים:

The legs fail through lameneſs;
And a parable in the mouth of fools.

الزمن, *The legs are weak through time*, or the infirmities of age: where דליו is expreſſed by *weak*; and the מ in מפסח is conſidered as a Prepoſition; agreeably to what is above obſerved concerning the meaning of theſe two words. This MS contains a *Tranſlation* of the Book of *Proverbs*. And it may be of uſe to obſerve further, that there is another anonymous MS, in the ſame language, which makes a part of the ſame Collection, numb. 70, and was likewiſe never printed; which, beſides a *Tranſlation* of this Book, different from the former, contains a *Commentary* on it.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVI, 23.

כסף סיגים מצפה על חרש
שפתים דלקים ולב רע׃

Burning lips, and a wicked heart,
Are like *a potſherd covered with ſilver droſs.*

A LEARNED Commentator [a] has obſerved, that the *Jewiſh* Expoſitors are not well agreed in their Accounts of this Similitude. And we may ſay the ſame of the *Chriſtian*; one [b] of whom introduces his Comment on this Text with ſaying, that there is a greater variety of opinions among Interpreters concerning the meaning of it, than any one would perhaps expect. This variety has been chiefly occaſioned by the difficulty of making out that Correſpondence, which we muſt ſuppoſe to have been intended, between the two phraſes כסף סיגים and שפתים דלקים. What various methods they have purſued in their endeavours upon this ſubject, may be ſeen in their writings. But leaving theſe, I ſhall confine myſelf here to that one interpretation; which, upon the matureſt conſideration, ſeems to me the moſt probable.

[a] *Munſter.* [b] Profeſſor *Schultens.*

As

As to the word שפתים; it's proper ſignification is *Lips*, which by an eaſy figure will denote *Words*, or *Speech*, uttered by the *Lips*. The participle דלקים, joined with it, comes from דלק; which ſometimes ſignifies in Scripture to *burn*, ſometimes to *purſue*. An inſtance of the firſt ſenſe may be *Ezek.* XXIV, 10: where the Prophet, ſpeaking of the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* under the parable of a *boiling pot*, receives this command from God, הרלק האש *kindle the fire*. Of the other an inſtance is taken from 1 *Sam.* XVII, 53: where the *Iſraelites* are ſaid to be returned מרלק אחרי פלשתים, *from chaſing*, or purſuing, *after the Philiſtines*. In which of theſe two ſenſes the participle is to be taken here, has been a diſpute among the Commentators. I agree with thoſe, who prefer the notion of *burning*; not only, as that alone ſuits the idea of the *melting of ſilver*, alluded to in the other Hemiſtich; but alſo, as it appears to be the common acceptation of the word, both in the *Chaldee* and *Syriac* languages. But what then is the meaning of *burning*, when applied to *Lips*? What are *burning Lips*? I anſwer, Lips glowing with ſpecious, though falſe, profeſſions of love and friendſhip; and ſeeking to varniſh over the turpitude of a *wicked*, or (as the word רע, which follows, may be rendered) a *malignant* heart, by the warm but deceitful gloſs of a flattering tongue.

Thus much for the difficult phraſe, שפתים דלקים. And, as to the no leſs difficult phraſe, כסף סיגים; it may be obſerved, that what our tranſlators here render *ſilver droſs* is not written סיגים כסף (or rather סיגי

סיגי כסף *) as in *Ezek.* XXII, 18; where it is rightly rendered *droſs*, or, as it is there in the margin, *droſſes of ſilver*. But here the words are, with their order inverted, כסף סיגים, *ſilver of droſs* or *droſſes*, which is quite a different thing; and this phraſe is, in this very place, interpreted by *Aben Ezra* to mean כסף מזוקק מסיגים *ſilver purified from droſſes*.

THERE ſeems to be a peculiar beauty here, and elſewhere, in the plurality of the word סיגים *droſſes*; as expreſſing that *whole of the droſs*, which is ſeparated from the ſilver by the firſt and ſecond and every repeated act of melting it. For every ſuch freſh act would (till it were purified perfectly) leave ſome droſs; and

* That *the final Mem* is at preſent found in our printed copies frequently inſerted, where it ſhould not be; and omitted in other places, where the language requires it; muſt have occurred to every attentive reader of the Hebrew Bible. And as the inſertion, or omiſſion, of this Letter is often of conſiderable conſequence to the Senſe; it may be worth while to refer the Reader to page 526 of *Dr Kennicott's Firſt Diſſertation on the Hebrew Text:* where it is ſhewn, *how*, and *through what cauſe*, this particular Letter has been thus inſerted, and omitted, improperly. His Note is this. *The reaſon, why the final* Mem *has been in ſome words improperly inſerted, and in others as improperly omitted, is well aſſigned by Vitringa,* Obſervat. ſacr. *p.* 187: *namely, that the Jews, in their antient copies of the Scriptures, as at preſent in their common writing, omitted the* ם, *and ſignified it by a Daſh, as* בנר'; *which oblique ſtroke, upon the filling up words that had been abbreviated, was ſometimes not obſerved, and conſequently the* ם *was omitted; or elſe the ſtroke was fancied to exiſt, and ſo the* ם *was inſerted.* I ſhall only add, that what *Dr Kennicott* has thus quoted here from *Vitringa*, and confirmed by ſeveral inſtances in the *printed* copies, he has lately found many proofs of, in ſome of the preſent *MSS* of the Hebrew Bible.

there can be no doubt, but the Antients did therefore refine repeatedly, when they wanted to render Silver *the moſt pure:* agreeably to that very appoſite Text, *Pſal.* XII, 6. כסף צרוף — מזקק שבעתים: *ſilver tried — purified ſeven times.* And thus we read in the book of *Proverbs* in the chapter preceding this of the Text, at verſe the 5th — חנו סיגים מכסף *Take away the droſſes* (every particle of droſs) *from the ſilver*; and then *ſhall there come forth a veſſel for the refiner:* in conſequence of which illuſtration it follows — חנו רשע *Take away* (not, I apprehend, *the wicked*, but) WICKEDNESS, *from before the king*; *and* then *his throne will be eſtabliſhed* בצדק *in righteouſneſs.* In this view, the words כסף סיגים will ſignify here *ſilver frequently purified*, and *well-refined:* and thus will the Correſpondence between this and the former phraſe be extremely evident; *the luſtre of well-refined ſilver* anſwering to *the ardour and warmth of flattering lips.*

IF the Reader therefore will add the particle of Similitude here, at the beginning of the ſecond Hemiſtich; agreeably to the Remark at the end of a former Diſſertation, p. 98, and upon the authorities of the *Syriac* and *Vulgate* Verſions with that of the *Chaldee Paraphraſe* on this Text: he may conſider this verſe in the manner following.

כסף סיגים מצפה על חרש
שפתים דלקים ולב רע:

Refined ſilver, ſpread over a potſherd;
So are ardent lips, and a wicked heart.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVII, 6.

נאמנים פצעי אוהב
ונעתרות נשיקות שונא׃

Faithful are the wounds of a friend:
But the kiſſes of an enemy are deceitful.

THE Antitheſis of theſe two Hemiſtichs is clear, at firſt ſight; but it will appear to be more ſo, upon looking into the full and genuine meaning of ſome of the terms. To begin with אוהב and שונא, the two characters concerned in the Aphoriſm. Our Verſion ſtiles them *Friend* and *Enemy*; but this does not come up to the ſenſe of the Original. The *Vulgate* is more juſt, *Diligentis* and *Odientis*. For they are two participial nouns of the active form: whereof אוהב is properly *loving*: and ſignifies one that has a real Eſteem and hearty Affection for a Man, whether he makes any great Shew of *Friendſhip*, or not. And שונא, on the other hand, is *hating*; and ſignifies one that bears Malice in his Heart, and has a ſecret Ill-will and inveterate Spite againſt a Man; let him, for ſome ſiniſter Views of his own, pretend to be ever ſo much his Friend. There is the ſame Oppoſition between the *Actions* of

theſe two *perſons*. The *Wounds*, i. e. the juſt Reproofs and kind Chaſtiſements of the former, are ſaid to be נאמנים, *faithful, truſty, ſafe, ſecure, that may be relied on, and confided in*; and the like: which are the ordinary notions of אמן both in *Hebrew* and the neighbouring Dialects. Whereas, on the contrary, the *Kiſſes*, i. e. the endearing Careſſes, and ſpecious Profeſſions of the latter, are נעתרות, *deceitful, treacherous, unſteady, inſecure, inſnaring, ſeducing to ruin* &c—ſignifications as oppoſite to thoſe of נאמנים, as can well be imagined: but not, at this day, to be found under the *Hebrew* עתר; the common meaning of which is that of *praying*, or *deprecating*, which is no otherwiſe expreſſive of the Contraſt that is between the two Hemiſtichs, than as what is *deceitful* and *treacherous*, is alſo to be *deprecated* or *averted*, if poſſible, *by our Prayers*. But this is a ſtrained Etymology, owing to mere Conjecture; and rather ſhews what the nature of the place requires, than what the word really ſignifies. It's true and proper import however is ſtill extant in the *Arabic* language; where عثر is *cæſpitavit, impegit, offendit, præceps lapſus eſt*; as likewiſe, actively, *fecit impingere, in anguſtias adegit, in malum induxit*; from whence عاثور, *foſſa quæ paratur capiendo leoni aliiſque feris*; as alſo معثرة, *offendiculum, laqueus*. * Theſe authorities may be

* Nor muſt I omit to take notice of another *Arabic* ſignification of عثر, which is preſerved in the great Lexicon called *Kamûs*, or the *Ocean*; and helps to make out the Antitheſis, there is between the two parts of the verſe, in the moſt direct manner. The verb is there explained by كذب to *lie*, or *deceive*; a ſignification, which is mentioned by the learned *Houbigant* in his Note on the place, and adopted in his Tranſlation of it, which is accordingly *fallacia*. Nor was this ſenſe unknown to St. *Jerom* (whether he learnt

ſufficient to juſtify the ſignifications I have above attributed to נעתרות, and to point out the Oppoſition that is between that and נאמנים. And yet I ſhall add *R. Levi*'s Account of the Word, as being exactly agreeable to what has been here deduced from the *Arabic*. For, having given a very juſt explication of the firſt Hemiſtich, he comes to the latter, on which he ſays — אך נשיקות שונא הם נהפכות כי מראה לו אהבה להכשילו ולהפילו ברשת רצונו i. e. *But the kiſſes of the* Soné, *or man that hates, are of a contrary nature; for he makes a ſhew of love to a perſon, only to ſupplant him, and draw him into his net at his pleaſure.*

AND ſo much for this Aphoriſm. That, which immediately precedes it, is upon the ſame Subject; and may, with a little alteration in the common Tranſlation, which the Connexion ſeems to require, be exhibited to the Reader under the ſame view.

טובה תוכחת מגלה
מאהבה מסתרת:
נאמנים פצעי אוהב
ונעתרות נשיקות שונא:

Better is reproof, that layeth open (a fault);
Than love, that concealeth (it).
Faithful are the wounds of one, who loveth:
But deceitful are the kiſſes of one, who hateth.

learnt it in his travels into *Paleſtine*, or collected it from it's congruity to the ſcope of the text) who has *fraudulenta*; from whence probably our Engliſh *deceitful*. Poſſibly this word עתר, and other *Hebrew* words, might, in *Jerom*'s days, have meanings given to them by the *Rabbins*, which meanings have been ſince loſt amongſt the *Jews:* and yet they may have been preſerved amongſt the *Arabians*.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVII, 15.

דלף טורד ביום סגריר
ואשת מדונים נשתוה׃

A continual dropping in a very rainy day,
And a contentious woman are alike.

THIS Compariſon occurred once before; *viz.* Chap. XIX, 13. And it ſhould have been conſidered there; but I choſe to reſerve what I had to ſay of it 'till now, that I might at the ſame time give ſome account of יום סגריר, which is here added, and is not without it's weight. Much light may be derived to this Aphoriſm from comparing the *Greek* Tranſlations of both places; as having preſerved the genuine and primary ſignifications of the word טורד, on which the ſenſe of the whole chiefly turns. The Tranſlations I mean, are thoſe of *Aquila* and *Symmachus*, in chap. XIX; and that of the *Septuagint* here. I ſhall examine them apart; and ſhew how agreeable they are to the notion of the Original word, as it was probably uſed in the times of theſe Interpreters. And becauſe thoſe of *Aquila* and *Symmachus* are prior in order of the Book; I ſhall begin with them: and, firſt, with *Aquila*'s, which

which is, Σταγητος συντομος, αντιδοσει χωλικος: where *Nobilius* interprets συντομος by *continuum*; and *Montfaucon*, by *continuans*; with an eye, as I ſuppoſe, more to the ſenſe of the place, than to the uſe of the word; becauſe the word ſignifies no ſuch thing, but rather the contrary. The true reading of the *Greek* is undoubtedly (what the very ingenious and judicious Mr *Nicholas Fuller* gueſſes it to be) συντονος, *i. e.* according to *Heſychius*, σφοδρος, ισχυος, συνεχης, *vehement*, *ſtrong*, *continued*; by a Metaphor taken from the *Bending of a Bow*, which requires the application and continuance of ſome force. So that Σταγητος συντονος is ſuch a *Dropping* as is *vehement and intenſe*, *holding on without Intermiſſion*, *and abating nothing of it's former Impetuoſity*. And that טורד was formerly underſtood in the ſame latitude, appears from it's ordinary uſe at this day in the *Arabic* language, which is, *to ruſh one on another*; to *thruſt out*; to *ſucceed*, or *follow*; to *continue*, or *hold on* *; as alſo (which comes home to our point) to *tire with much ſpeaking*; to *ſtupify and drive away one's hearers with long reading*. Nor are the *Rabbins* ſtrangers to this meaning. They too, according to *Kimchi* and *Elias Levita*, by טורד underſtand *one*, שעשקו תמיד על ענין ולא שקט ממנו, *who is always at his work*, *and never ceaſes from it*. Accordingly *Aben-Ezra* here renders it, שלא ישקט; *that never ceaſes*. And on *Iſai.* LVII, 20; the *Targum* calls *the troubled Sea* (that cannot reſt) ימא דטריד. From all which it is plain, that *Aquila*'s συντονος did not

* *Geogr. Nub.* Arab. p. 53. عيون مطردة, *fontes perpetuò erumpentes*. And, p. 83. مبا تطرد ليلا ونهارا, *aquæ ſcaturiunt nocte dieque*.

proceed

proceed from any arbitrary Conjecture of his own; but was founded on ſuch a ſenſe of the *Hebrew*, as was well known in his time, and appeared to him to be expreſſive of ſuch a kind of *Dropping*, as would give his reader a juſt notion of the *violent*, *intenſe*, *uninterrupted clamour* of a *ſcolding Tongue*. And thus much for *Aquila*'s Verſion.

THE next is that of *Symmachus*: Σταγονες καταασσομεναι, μαχαι γυναικων, *Guttæ feſtinantes*, *rixæ mulieris*; Nobil. *Stillæ celeres*, *pugnæ mulieris*; Montfauc. Here we have another notion of טורד, now no longer to be found in the *Hebrew*; but plainly ſhewn to have been once there by the accounts ſtill preſerved of it in the *Arabic* dialect: where, beſides what is above ſet down, it denotes likewiſe the *Rapidity* or *Swiftneſs* of a *Stream*. In this Tranſlation, then, we have *Fluency* and *Celerity* added to the *Violence* and *Aſſiduity* of the *Dropping*; which makes it ſtill a fitter emblem of a *ſcolding Tongue*, which is generally as *haſty* and *nimble*, as it is *boiſterous* and *violent*. This notion the word καταασσομεναι will furniſh us with; taken, in it's intranſitive ſenſe, for *haſty*, or *quick*. But if we underſtand it tranſitively, as it ſignifies likewiſe *to haſten*, or *cauſe to make haſte*; to *urge*, *impell*, *drive on*, or the like, as it often imports: this Tranſlation will then coincide with

THE Third, that of the *Septuagint* in this place; which is, Σταγονες εκβαλλουσιν ανθρωπον εν ημερα χειμερινη εκ του οικου αυτου, ωσαυτως και γυνη λοιδορος εκ του ιδιου οικου, *ſtillicidia ejiciunt hominem in die hyemali de domo ſuâ: ſimiliter et mulier maledica de propriâ domo*. Here טורד is expreſſed by

εκβαλλειν,

ἐκβαλλειν, which is another of it's antient ſignifications, as appears from *Dan.* IV: where it is put to ſignify *Nebuchadnezzar's being driven from human Society*; and that, not only in the Original *Chaldee*, but likewiſe in the *Arabic* Tranſlation of it; which ſhews that the Tranſlator thought he could not expreſs the ſame thing better, than by retaining the ſame word. As indeed he could not; the ordinary notion of טרד being *perſequi*, *exagitare*, *abigere*, *ablegare*; from whence טרדה, *Exul*. With the ſame view *Aben-Ezra* and others render it מנרש, which is literally ἐκβαλλειν. Nor is this notion of the *Septuagint* inconſiſtent with thoſe of *Aquila* and *Symmachus* before mentioned, but rather a conſequence of them; *Expulſion from an Houſe* being the natural effect of a *continued*, *vehement*, *intenſe*, *accelerated Dropping thereupon*.

It is added here, in the XXVIIth Chapter, ביום סגריר: where סגריר may be looked upon as one of the ἅπαξ λεγομενα. It's uſual Etymology is what *Aben-Ezra* gives us in his Note upon the place. *A Day*, ſays he, *is called* סגריר; *becauſe in it men* יסגרו *are ſhut up*: which being in caſe of *Bad Weather*, it is accordingly rendered ſometimes *Rainy*, ſometimes *Cold*, ſometimes *Wintry*; and ſometimes in the ſuperlative degree, of which the repetition of the ר is looked upon to be the ſign, *Very Rainy*; as in our Tranſlation. This is the only account we can have of the word from the preſent *Hebrew*. But if we ſuppoſe the Verb סגר to have been of the ſame import formerly in that language, as it is ſtill in the *Arabic*; this ſignification of *rainy*, *ſtormy*, &c. will follow much more clearly from it. In this

Dialect, it ſignifies *to ſwell with Rain*; *to fill a River with Water*: from whence بحر المسجور *a ſwelling*, or *tempeſtuous Sea*; and مسجر is an *Eruption*, or *Inundation of Water*. And, that it may want nothing to render it applicable to the preſent occaſion; it has moreover the notion of *following one another in a continued ſeries*. And now, what can יום סגריר be, but *a Day of continual Storm and Tempeſt*? And what can be expected from *ſuch a Day*, but ſuch a *Dropping* as is above deſcribed? Or what more proper to be compared to it, than the violent *Raging*, and uninterrupted *Hurricane*, of a *Scolding Woman*?

And thus much for the *Greek* Verſions; which may now appear not to have been made by Conjecture, or taken up at random (as thoſe very uſeful Tranſlations, where they have happened to contain any thing different from the received Opinions, have, to the no little prejudice of Truth, been ſometimes thought to have been:) but to have proceeded from, and been grounded on, ſuch Significations of the *Original Hebrew*, as there is great reaſon to think were *known*, and *allowed of*, in their days. According to theſe, יום מזיר is a very elegant and comprehenſive phraſe, as indeed it ſeems to have been thought by *Solomon* himſelf: or at leaſt by the *Collectors* of his Sayings, in that it is put down Twice in ſo narrow a compaſs. The Reader may now take the whole Import of it, as above given, in one View, thus.

דלֶף מורד ביום סגריר
ואשת מדנים נשתוה׃

Continued is the dropping, in a very rainy day;
And a woman of contentions maketh herſelf like to it.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVII, 22.

אם תכתוש את האויל במכתש בתוך הריפות בעלי
לא תסור מעליו אולתו׃

Though thou ſhouldeſt bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a peſtil, yet *will not his fooliſhneſs depart from him.*

AQUILA and *Theodotion*, inſtead of *Wheat* (by which our Tranſlators, and ſome others, render the word הריפות) have εμπτισσομενων, *contuſorum ſeu piſtorum, things bruiſed* or *pounded*; which ſeems to be a more proper rendering. For this is of a more extenſive ſignification; and comprehends not only *that*, but likewiſe *Barley*, *Oats*, *Rice*, *Lentils*, or any other Grain of the like ſort; which the Antients uſed to *bruiſe* in *Mortars*, as we do now in *Mills*, in order to *decorticate*, or clear it from it's Huſk or Skin; and thereby qualify it for ſeveral Uſes, which otherwiſe it would have been unfit for: ſuch as making *Broths*, *Ptiſans*, *Flummeries*, and the like. The Original of the *Hebrew* Word is very obſcure; there being nothing in all the Bible, from whence it can be deduced, but the ſingle Verb ירופפו, *Job* XXVI, 11. Nor yet can this be eaſily ſuppoſed it's

Radix, though commonly aſſigned for ſuch; as being there uſed not for *beating* or *bruiſing*, but for *ſhaking* or *trembling*; as it is expounded by the *Rabbins*, and rightly *Engliſhed* by our Tranſlators. I rather think εμπτιοσομενων came from ſome Verb, antiently in uſe among the *Hebrews*, though not now to be found in their Lexicons; of the ſame form and import in their language, with رفت in that of the *Arabs*, viz. *fregit, comminuit*; from whence رفات, *res fracta minutatim*. Of near affinity with which is رفش, *qui palâ frumentum vertit movetque*. But whenceſoever it came; it ſuits well with the place, and makes a good ſenſe. *Though thou beat a fool in a mortar, among things bruiſed with a peſtil; yet will not his folly depart* (or *thou ſhalt not remove his folly*) *from him.*

From him. The Hebrew is מעליו, *from off him*: which is more emphatical: Though thou chaſtiſe a fool to ſuch a degree of ſeverity, as even to *excoriate* him, or (as we ſay) *beat his ſkin from his bones*; yet ſo inveterate, ſo irradicated, ſo conſtitutionary is his Folly and Wickedneſs, that thou ſhalt not *ſtir* it, or make the leaſt impreſſion upon him.

[a] Dr *Caſtell* takes another way: and as he renders כתש *to threſh*, ſo by it's verbal מכתש he underſtands a *Place to threſh in*, or *Barn-floor*. Which account is not only [b] conformable to the idiom of the *Hebrew* tongue; but is likewiſe warranted by the authority of the *Tar-*

[a] Lexicon, in voce כתש.

[b] So *Num.* XI, 8; from דכה, *to beat*, comes מדכה, *a thing to beat in*, or a *Mortar*.

gum,

gum, which has באודך, *in aredâ tuâ*. And then הריפות will not be *things bruiſed*, but *things threſhed*; as indeed it ſeems to ſignify 2 *Sam.* XVII, 19, the only place where it is uſed but here. Nor will עלי be an Inſtrument to be uſed in the *Mortar*, but the *Barn*; whether *Plank*, *Wheel*, or *Rod*; for all theſe (as it is plain from the XXVIIIth of *Iſaiah*) were uſed by the antient People of the Eaſt, as with us the *Flail* is, for forcing out and ſeparating the Grain from the Chaff. In reſpect of which latter uſe of *Threſhing*; it's Etymology from עלה, *to be lifted up*, or to *go over*, will be no leſs proper, than in the former of *bruiſing*. In this view of the words, the ſenſe will be:

Though thou threſh a fool on the floor among corn with a threſhing-inſtrument; yet wilt thou not remove his folly from him.

The LXX make the Place, where the *fool* is *beaten*, to be, ἐν μεσῳ σωρῳ, or, as other Copies read it, σωρῳ. And ſo the *Syriac* and *Arabic*, as likewiſe the *Chaldee*, though it has alſo אורך, *area*, as above; for what reaſon is not eaſy to ſay: unleſs they looked upon this *Chaſtiſement* of the *Fool* to be *Judicial*; or in conſequence of ſome Sentence pronounced on him by the civil Magiſtrates, *aſſembled together* for the adminiſtration of public Juſtice.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVIII, 3.

גבר רש ועשק דלים
מטר סחף ואין לחם׃

A poor man, that oppreſſeth the poor,
Is like *a ſweeping rain, which leaveth no food.*

THESE words are much more ſtrong and emphatical in the Original, than in this, or any other Tranſlation I have ſeen of them. Particularly, גבר ſignifies not only *Man*, as it is here rendered; but includes in it likewiſe the notion of *Power*, or *Might*; from the verb גבר, *prævaluit, auctoritate excelluit, ſuperbivit*; the known radix of גבור, *præpotens, gigas*: which the LXX ſeem to have been aware of, putting ανδρειος. And ſo דלים denotes not only *Poor*, but alſo *Infirm*, or *Weak*; it's theme דלל being indifferent to both, and ſignifying (as *Buxtorf* rightly expreſſes it) *tenuem eſſe tam Viribus, quam Facultatibus.* According to this account, there will appear to be a very elegant Contraſt between the words גבר רש, which we may now expound *the poor man in power*; and דלים, *the poor*, or *weak*. For, as by the former we may underſtand

derſtand one, who having lately, by ſome accident or other, emerged from a very low Fortune to ſome conſiderable Office or Employment; and (which is often the caſe) forgetting from whence he came, takes advantage from his ſuperior ſtation to *oppreſs* and *tyranniſe* over thoſe, he has left behind him: ſo what ſhould דלים be, on the other ſide, but thoſe *helpleſs* wretches, who, having been ſo unfortunate as to fall into his hands, can neither ſupport themſelves under his inſolent Incroachments, nor dare oppoſe them? Of the *Cruelty* of the one of theſe Parties, and the *Miſery* of the other, there cannot poſſibly be a ſtronger Image, than what the Compariſon before us furniſhes us with; where this *Beggarly Oppreſſor*, this *Hungry Tyrant*, is exhibited under the denomination of מטר סחף, which our Tranſlators render *a ſweeping Rain*. The word סחף, *ſweeping*, occurs but once more in the whole Bible, and that is *Jer.* XLVI, 15; where it is likewiſe taken in the notion of *ſweeping away*. But this does not by any means come up to the force of the word; the full and genuine import of which is now to be learnt only from the *Arabic* language, where we have سحف, *raſit*, *abraſit*, *excoriavit*: from whence السحف, *torrens*; سحبنة, *pluvia vehementior*, *res obvias aſportans*: as likewiſe هوم مسحوف, *terra ſummâ parte excoriata*, *veluti abraſâ ſuperficie*; as *Giggeus* explains the phraſe. So that מטר סחף is properly ſuch a *Rain*, as does not only *ſweep away* the Fruits of the Earth, but together with them *tears up* and *carries away* the very Earth itſelf; and ſo not only deſtroys it's preſent Crop, but likewiſe renders it incapable of producing any thing for the time to come. A lively Emblem this of a *half-ſtarved Villain*,

Villain, newly got into power: who, not content with making moderate Depredations on thoſe he has to do with, as one who ſhould come into the ſame Office in better circumſtances would be, bears down all before him, overthrows the Bounds of common Juſtice and Humanity, ſwallows up both the preſent Poſſeſſions and future Hopes of whole Families, and ſpreads Miſery and Deſtruction wherever he goes. I render therefore:

A man, who hath been poor, and oppreſſeth the weak,
Is a rain that ſweepeth away, ſo that there is no food.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVIII, 11.

חכם בעיניו איש עשיר
ודל מבין יחקרנו׃

The rich man is wiſe in his own conceit:
But the poor that hath underſtanding ſearcheth him out.

THE Antients have left us two different ſenſes of the word יחקרנו. *Aquila* and *Theodotion* render it εξιχνιασει αυτον, *ſhall trace* or *ſearch him out*, as in our Verſion; and ſo the Vulgate, *ſcrutabitur*: which is the uſual ſignification of the *Hebrew*. The *Chaldee* Paraphraſt and the *Syriac* Tranſlator have בסר, *contemnit eum*, *contemns* or *deſpiſes him*; in the common notion of the *Arabic* حقر. *Solomon* probably had both theſe ſenſes in his view. For what can the reſult of the *Search*, or *Examination* here made be, but *Contempt*? The perſon that makes it, though ſaid to be דל, *a man of a mean condition*, is yet מבין, *a man of judgment* and *diſcretion*: that knows how to diſtinguiſh between Realities and Appearances; to value things according to their intrinſick Worth, and not according to their outward Shew; to conſider the Man, abſtracted from his Eſtate; and to eſtimate him, not according to what he

poſſeſſes, but according to the Uſe he makes of it. This is to be the *Enquirer*. The Perſon, that is to be the Subject of his *Enquiry*, is the *Rich Man*, that is *wiſe in his own eyes*; that, giving way too eaſily either to the partial ſuggeſtions of his own Imagination, or the inſidious flatteries of Sycophants, is apt to fancy himſelf as much ſuperior to other Men in *Wiſdom*, as he is in *Wealth*. As if the *Gifts of the Mind* were the neceſſary concomitants of the *Gifts of Fortune*; and the Quantity of Eſteem, he ſtands intitled to, were to be in proportion to the Largeneſs of his Revenues. But, in this he will find himſelf miſtaken. Whatever he may ſeem to be in his *own eyes*; the judicious Obſerver will ſoon *diſcover* enough of his *Head* and *Heart*, to give him a very *mean opinion* of him. And to this double notion of חקר the *Septuagint*, if I am not much miſtaken, had an eye in their κατεγνωσται, which ſhould not then be rendered *condemnabit*, as it's *Latin* tranſlation has it; but *arguet* or *contemnet*, as *Stephens* ſhews that verb ſometimes to ſignify. I ſhall endeavour to take in both ſenſes, and render:

The rich man is wiſe in his own eyes:
But the poor man, that has diſcernment to trace him out, *will* deſpiſe *him.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVIII, 12.

בעלץ צדיקים רבה תפארת
ובקום רשעים יחפש אדם :

When righteous men do rejoice, there is great glory:
But when the wicked riſe, a man is hidden.

THE verb יחפש, on which the meaning of the Second Hemiſtich depends, is by the Antient Interpreters taken in ſeveral ſenſes; moſt of which, though different from what it now ſignifies, may be preſumed to have formerly belonged to it, by the Uſes it ſtill has in the *Arabic* Language. The *Vulgar* renders it *ruinæ* [*ſunt*]; which is the notion of خفش, *diruit, proſtrauit.* The LXX ἁλισκονται *capiuntur*; which ſtill appears in خبس *cepit manu, ſpolium retulit.* The *Arabic*, which in this book generally follows the *Greek*, here departs from it, preferring يفنون *peribunt*; which notion is ſtill ſubſiſting in the two neighbouring verbs حفت *perdidit*, and قفس *mortuus fuit.* The former of which likewiſe ſignifies *comminuit*, and may have given occaſion to the *Syriac* ܚܦܫ, *minuitur* viz. *gloria.* And as theſe ſeveral ſignifications fall in with the Antient Uſes of the

Verb, preſerved in the *Arabic*; ſo they alſo favour the Antitheſis of the two Hemiſtichs; the various Miſchiefs they ſet forth as conſequent to the *Wicked* Man's *coming into power* (for ſo is קום to be underſtood here;) being directly oppoſite to the Benefits, that attend the Advancement of the *Good*.

WERE the verb חפש therefore uſed no where elſe; we might acquieſce in one or other of theſe notions, as what might probably have been intended by *Solomon*. But as it occurs in ſeveral other places, it behoves us to enquire whether it may not be there taken in ſuch a ſenſe, as may be proper here; that ſo we may proceed according to the Analogy of Scripture, and not rely merely on the Authority of Interpreters. It's uſual ſignifications in the Bible are two, and thoſe ſeemingly contrary to each other, *hiding* or *diſguiſing*, and *ſearching out* or *diſcovering*: both taken notice of by our Tranſlators; the one in the Text, the other in the Margin. I take the former to be the more proper here, (as they likewiſe ſeem to have done by their putting it in the Text) as being not only the more *oppoſite* to the *public rejoicing* implied in תפארת, but alſo as it is more agreeable to verſe 28th: where (if I am not miſtaken) we have the very ſame ſenſe again expreſſed by יסתר; which plainly ſignifies *hidden*, and can ſignify nothing elſe. The words are בקום רשעים יסתר אדם, *when the wicked riſe, men are hidden*: where I take יסתר to be ſynonymous to יחפש, as אדם is to איש. And if to the notion of *hidden* or *diſguiſed* we add that of the neighbouring خفت *obmutuit, clanculum murmuravit*; it will give ſtill further force to the *Oppoſition* of the

two

two Hemiſtichs: which will then be to this effect. Whereas, when a *man of Virtue and Probity*, who ſtudies the Honour and Intereſt of the Community, or Neighbourhood to which he belongs, is advanced to any conſiderable Poſt, or bleſſed with any ſignal Succeſs in his Affairs; the People, who ſhare the happy Effects of his Proſperity, fail not to expreſs their Pleaſure and Satisfaction by the moſt public Demonſtrations of Joy. On the contrary, when a *Wicked* man, whoſe private Views ſuperſede all manner of regard for the Welfare of Society, has by ſome means or other forced himſelf into a ſuperior ſtation: thoſe very Men (for I take אישׁ collectively) who delight to be the foremoſt in proclaiming the *Glories* of a *good* Government, being moſt juſtly apprehenſive of the *Calamities* of a *bad*, have nothing left them, but to *quit* the ſtage of the world, to *retire in ſilence and diſguiſe*, and *privately contrive* to ſecure themſelves and their Fortunes. I render therefore,

When the righteous prevail, there is great rejoicing:
But when the wicked riſe [to power] *men retire* [in ſilence.]

Having mentioned the verb יסתר, I cannot diſmiſs it without making one obſervation on the *Greek* Tranſlation of it; which, according to the common reading, is ϛωθσι, rendered by it's *Latin* Tranſlator *ingemiſcunt*. I rather think it ſhould be ϛωθσι, or ϛωθττσι, not from ϛωω *gemo*, but from ϛωοω *in anguſtum ſpatium redigo*. Not only becauſe this notion is more ſuitable to the common Acceptation

Acceptation of סתר *to hide*, or *cover*; but likewiſe becauſe the *Arabic* Tranſlator, who, as I hinted juſt now, is generally a cloſe Follower of the *Septuagint*, expounds it by يضيق حال القسطين *anguſtus erit ſtatus juſtorum*; as indeed the tenor of the Antitheſis required: it following, *But when they* (the wicked) *periſh, the righteous increaſe.*

It may likewiſe be obſerved, that the ſame *Greek* Interpreters in both places tranſlate בקום by ἐν τοπῳ. Is it becauſe they read במקום? Or did they, by their τοπος, underſtand the ſame as we ſometimes do by our *Engliſh Place*; viz. *Rank, Office, Poſt, Preferment*, &c? It is certain, according to *Stephens*, that τοπος may ſignify the ſame with ταξις, which is not only *Ordo*, but *Officium, Munus*, &c.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVIII, 16.

נגיד חסר תבונות ורב מעשקות
שנאי בצע יאריך ימים׃

A prince, that wanteth underſtanding, is alſo a great oppreſſour:
But he that hateth covetouſneſs ſhall prolong his days.

IT is not eaſy to form a clear and diſtinct notion of the *Antitheſis* between the two parts of this Verſe. The learned *Bochart* (Anim. S. p. 1, l. 3, c. 25) takes the words to be Elliptical; and thinks that ſomething is wanting in the Firſt Hemiſtic, to anſwer to יאריך ימים in the Second; which he ſupplies thus: *Dux carens intelligentiâ, et multus oppreſſionibus* (ſupple *abbreviabit dies ſuos:*) at *qui odit quæſtum, prolongabit dies.* Thus he, on ſuppoſition of an Ellipſis. But perhaps we may make out the *Oppoſition*, without having recourſe to this expedient. In order to which, it may be obſerved, that the phraſe רב מעשקות rendered *great oppreſſor*, is literally *much in oppreſſions*, as *Bochart* has it above; and may as well be taken *paſſively* for one that *ſuffereth*, as *actively* for one that *cauſeth, great Oppreſſions.*

Oppreſſions. And ſo it ſeems to have been taken by the *Syriac* Tranſlator; who has ܥܒܕ ܫܘܬ ܒܝܫ ܡܠܟܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐ i. e. (according to the *Polyglott*-Latin) *Principis mente carentis multæ erunt jacturæ.* In this view, the *Prince* that is *much in Oppreſſions* will be one, who by his Raſhneſs and Indiſcretion, either in graſping at too much Power, or making unjuſt Acquiſitions to his private Fortune, draws on him the Diſaffection and Hatred of his Subjects; and ſo runs himſelf into ſuch Difficulties, as render his Reign both ſhort and uncomfortable. In which regard, he is the very reverſe of the prudent *Ruler* in the next Hemiſtic; who, having an utter abhorrence of every thing ſordid and avaritious, ſeeks to diſtinguiſh himſelf by a continued courſe of generous and noble Actions: and thereby eſtabliſhes his Government on the moſt firm and laſting baſis, the hearty Affections and chearful Obedience of a grateful and happy People. I render therefore,

A prince, that wanteth conſideration, ſuffereth great oppreſſions:
But he, that hateth covetouſneſs, ſhall prolong his days.

But if the *active* ſignification of רב מעשקות is to be preferred, as following more naturally from the former Verſe, where a *wicked Prince* is compared to a *roaring Lion* and *hungry Bear:* we may then try to make out the *Oppoſition* another way; and that is by taking יאריך, in the latter Hemiſtic, *intranſitively*; not for *prolonging* or *extending*, but for *waiting long* or *having much patience.* And then ימים will denote the *ſpace* of the *Waiting*, or the *degree* of the *Patience*; viz. *ſome*

ſome Days, or (as the word will bear) *ſome Time*. And in this ſenſe the verb ארך is taken Chap. XIX, 11 of this very Book; where האריך אפו is not *prolongeth* or *continueth his Anger*, but (the quite contrary) *deferreth* or *putteth off his Anger*. This the LXX well expreſs by their ſingle word μακροθυμει, *waiteth* or *expecteth a great while*; and the *Arabic* after them, by ﺍﻃﺎﻝ *longanimis fuit*: as alſo *Aquila* and *Theodotion*, by the ſubſtantive μακροθυμια *longanimity* or *patience*. And ſo the *Syriac*: which notion might likewiſe be further juſtified, if there were occaſion, from the Uſe of the word in the neighbouring Dialects. In the *Arabic* it is *permanere*, *cunctari*, *tardare*; in the *Chaldee*, *expectare*, *morari* &c. whence, *Gen.* VIII, 10, 12, אוריך is put by the *Targum* for the *Hebrew* יחל, to expreſs *Noah*'s *Waiting* for the *ſubſiding* of the *Deluge*. Where we may obſerve likewiſe, that ימים is uſed to denote the *Time* of the *Waiting*, in the very ſame manner as it is ſuppoſed to be in this Place. Here then the *Oppoſition* will lie between the *haſty Impatience* of the *one* Party, and the *gentle Forbearance* of the *other*: and the Senſe will be,

The prince, that wanteth conſideration, is a great oppreſſor:
But he, that hateth covetouſneſs, will wait ſome days.

The *Septuagint* for תבונות, which we have rendered *Conſideration*, have προσοδων *proventuum*; either reading תבואות, which ſo ſignifies, from בוא *venit*; or elſe, overlooking the difference between the two

Heemantic or *Servile* Letters, ה and י: a reading, which, according to the latter acceptation of the words, makes no improper Senſe:

The prince, that is ſtreightened in his revenues, is a great oppreſſor:
But he, that hateth covetouſneſs (or lucre) *will have patience ſome time.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVIII, 21.

הכר פנים לא טוב
ועל פת לחם יפשע גבר׃

To have reſpect of perſons, is not good:
For, for a piece of bread, that man will tranſgreſs.

I CANNOT paſs over theſe words, without taking notice of the *Syriac* Tranſlation of them, as ſeeming to give an eaſy and elegant ſenſe. It is, ܗܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܕܣܒܪ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܠܝܬ ܛܒ ܗܘ ܓܒܪܐ ܕܡܫܠܡ ܠܗ ܠܒܪ ܢܫܐ : in *Engliſh* thus,

A man, that hath reſpect of perſons, is not good:
For, for a piece of bread, he will betray a man.

WHERE טוב, which our Tranſlators render in the *Neuter* Gender, is taken in the *Maſculine*; being applied to the *Perſon*, who is the ſubject of the *Proverb*. And יפשע, which they uſe *intranſitively*, is here made *tranſitive*, and takes after it גבר, as it's *Accuſative* caſe, which with them is it's *Nominative*. And ſo far the *Greek* agrees with the *Syriac* — ὃς ἀγαθὸς — ἀποδοῦναι ἀνδρα.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXVIII, 22.

נבהל להון איש רע עין
ולא ידע כי חסר יבאנו׃

He, that haſteth to be rich, hath an evil eye:
And conſidereth not, that poverty ſhall come upon him.

THE LXX underſtand theſe words differently from all other Interpreters; except the *Arab*, who generally follows them. What is here tranſlated *Poverty*, they render ελεημων, *merciful*; the copy, or copies they followed, very probably preſenting them with חסר, inſtead of חסר: a Reading, which gives a very particular, though perhaps no improper, turn to the whole Sentence. Their Verſion is, Σπευδει πλουτειν ανηρ βασκανος· και ουκ οιδεν ὁτι ελεημων κρατησει αυτου: which I underſtand thus,

An envious man haſteth to get wealth:
And knoweth not, the merciful man (alone) *ſhall attain unto it.*

WHERE I ſuppoſe the laſt word αυτου to be of the *Neuter* Gender; referring it to πλουτειν. And, to make the

the relation between them more viſible, I render πλουτειν not, *to be rich*, but, *to get wealth*; that the Pronoun *it* may have a *Noun*, inſtead of a Verb, for it's *Antecedent*: which is likewiſe agreeable to the *Hebrew* הון, which ſome take for a *Noun*, rendering it *Opes*. The *Latin* Tranſlator for κρατησει αυτου has *obtinebit eum*, making αυτου relate to βασιλεια: but with what ſenſe, is not very eaſy to conceive. Were this the Conſtruction; I ſhould render, *ſhall come up to him*, or *overtake him*, viz. in his purſuit after *Riches*.

BEFORE I diſmiſs this חסד of the *Septuagint*; it may be obſerved, that it is capable of other ſenſes, and thoſe very different from that of *Mercy*, in which it is here taken. It may likewiſe ſignify *Reproach*, or *Diſgrace*; in the notion of יחסר, *Prov.* XXV, 5. And in the *Arabic* dialect it denotes *Envy*: both which are very apt to *come upon* the *Rich* man; and therefore the Thoughts of them may be no improper Diſcouragement to his ambitious Projects. — *And conſidereth not that Envy* (or *Diſgrace*) *ſhall come upon him.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXIX, 5.

גבר מחליק על רעהו
רשת פרש על פעמיו׃

A man, that flattereth his neighbour,
Spreadeth a net for his feet.

THE firſt phraſe מחליק על רעהו, here rendered, *flattereth his neighbour*, is literally *flattereth upon*, or *againſt*, *his neighbour*: which ſounding but harſhly in *Engliſh*, our Tranſlators have omitted the על. Others, to make way for expreſſing it, have recourſe to another ſignification of the verb חלק, which is that of *ſoftning*, or *ſmoothing*. So the Interlinear, *leniens ſuper ſocio ſuo*. But becauſe it may be doubted *what* it is, which the treacherous perſon in the Proverb thus *ſmoothes* or *ſoftens*; they have ſubſtituted ſeveral words, by way of Accuſative caſe to the Participle מחליק. Some underſtand *linguam*, *tongue*. R. *Levi* has דרך, *way*; rendering, *he that ſmootheth out a way for his neighbour*. Others prefer ſome other word. Not to dwell upon their ſeveral Conjectures, I ſhould think that, if מחליק be not taken for a *Flatterer*, as our Tranſlators interpret it, we had better

better ſtick to what ſeems to be the principal ſignification of the verb, that of *dividing*, *diſtributing*, or *laying out into parts*: and joining it with רשת, *net*, which our Tranſlators conſtrue with פרש in the ſecond Hemiſtic, underſtand it of the *diſtributing*, *laying out*, or *expanding* the ſeveral parts of the *Net*, in order the more effectually to encompaſs, or take in, what it is laid for. And to this agrees the uſe of the word in the *Arabic* language; where we have both, حلف *ambivit*, *cinxit*, *torſit funem*; and حلف *paravit*, *formavit*, *effinxit* &c. If this Conſtruction be admitted; it will be neceſſary that we underſtand פעמיו, *his feet*, not of the *feet* of him for whom the *Net is laid*, but of the *feet* of him who *lays it*: and ſo it is underſtood by the *Rabbins*. R. *Levi* above quoted, having ſet down פעמיו, *his feet*; that we may not be at a loſs whither to refer the ſuffix ו, or *his*, adds בעצמו, *his own*. And *Aben-Ezra* expreſſly declares, that the expreſſion, *his feet*, רבק כנבר מחליק, belongs to the *Geber mahhalic*; and then adds, כענין ורשת אשר טמן תלכדו i. e. *the Senſe being the ſame with that Pſ.* XXXV, 8: AND LET THE NET, THAT HE HATH HID, CATCH HIMSELF: and his argument for it is הפסוק הבא לעד, *the next Verſe is Witneſs*, i. e. a Proof of it. By which he would give us to underſtand, that he looked upon both Verſes to belong to the ſame ſubject; or, that the enſuing Verſe was a Continuation of the Doctrine advanced in this. And I do not know but, when the Reader has given himſelf the trouble to peruſe what is here offered, he may be of the ſame opinion.

He,

He, that layeth a net for his neighbour,
Spreadeth (it) *for his own feet.*
The wicked man is inſnared in the deceit;
But the righteous doth ſing, and rejoice.

WHAT led me to view the firſt Verſe in this light, was the *Greek* Verſion of it; which is, ὁς ἁρπαζει επι προσωπον τῳ ἑαυτῳ φιλῳ δικτυον, Περιβαλλει αυτο τοις ἑαυτῳ ποσι: which the *Arabic* follows, as uſual. And perhaps the *Chaldee Paraphraſt*, if rightly underſtood, may be found to ſpeak the ſame thing. His Verſion is, גברא דמתפלג על חבריה מצרתא פרש על חלכתיה; which it's *Latin* Tranſlator renders thus, *Vir qui dividitur a ſocio ſuo, rete expandit greſſibus ejus.* May it not be thus turned? *A man, that layeth out a net for his companion, ſpreadeth* (it) *for his own feet?* This Verſion will at leaſt have this advantage over the former: that it will come nearer the notion of על, which is *ad*, or *ſuper*; and not *a*, as it is there made to ſignify. The *Syriac* is, word for word, the ſame with the *Chaldee*; though differently rendered by it's *Latin* Interpreter.

OBSERVATIONS
ON
PROVERBS XXIX. 7.

צדק צדיק דין דלים
רשע לא־יבין דעת׃

The righteous conſidereth the cauſe of the poor:
But *the wicked regardeth not to know* it.

SOME interpreters expound the laſt word דעת as a Verb, others as a Noun. Ours take it for a Verb, and render it *to know:* and, to connect the two parts of the verſe, add the pronoun *it: The wicked regardeth not to know it*; viz. *the cauſe of the poor*, mentioned in the former Hemiſtic. *Aben-Ezra* takes it for a Noun, and explains it by משפט *Judgment*; by which, I ſuppoſe, he means any *Cauſe*, or *Action* brought before the Judge in a legal way, together with the ſtated *Rules* or *Methods* of proceeding thereon. And ſo the LXX, ὁ δὲ μὴ γνωσῃ, which their Tranſlator renders *non cogitat ſcientiam*; taking γνωσις in it's general notion of *Science*, or *Knowledge*. Whereas it is here perhaps to be looked on as a *forenſic* Term, and to be reſtrained to the *Cognizance* of the Law; as it is by *Demoſthenes* (Orat. de Coron.) in that expreſſion, τῶν δικαστηρίων γνώσεις,

judiciorum cognitiones: and ſo is equivalent to *Aben-Ezra's* משפט, juſt now mentioned. In this view, the word רעת falls in with the notion of the *Arabic* دعا *appellavit, provocavit; rem ſibi vindicavit,* vel *arrogavit:* from whence, دعوى *prætentio, actio, poſtulatio; cum quis aliquid ſibi debitum in judicio repoſcit:* which is exactly the caſe of the *poor* man in this place. Taking רעת therefore for a Noun, we may render:

The righteous will conſider the cauſe of the poor:
(But) *the wicked will not regard* (his) *ſuit.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXIX. 21.

מפנק מנעריו עבדו
והאחריתו יהיה בנו׃

He that delicately bringeth up his ſervant from a child,
Shall have him become his *ſon at the length.*

THIS Tranſlation is not literal. The Original, if the ſeveral words were taken in the ſenſes here given them, would ſound, *he that delicately bringeth up his ſervant from a child; and at length he will be a ſon.* Where we may obſerve, 1. that there is no Verb to the Nominative caſe מפנק, *he that bringeth up*; which our Tranſlators have therefore endeavoured to ſupply by rendering the Verb Subſtantive יהיה tranſitively, *ſhall have him become:* a ſignification, which I believe it has not in any other place of Scripture. Properly יהיה ſignifies *he ſhall be:* but then the whole Verſe would run, *he that delicately bringeth up his ſervant from a child, ſhall be his ſon*; which is abſurd. 2dly: the two Hemiſtics are coupled together by the Conjunction *and*, anſwering the *Hebrew* ו; which in our Tranſlation is dropt. 3dly: there being no ſuffix to the

word מנון, the Pronoun *his* in the *Engliſh* is an addition. From hence it appears, that our Verſion varies from the Letter of the Original. It will be therefore proper to examine the words; and ſee, whether they will not admit of ſuch a Conſtruction, as may come nearer to it. The firſt is מפנק; which, being an ἅπαξ λεγομδνον, as Expoſitors ſay, or occurring only here, is not to be illuſtrated by any other paſſage of Scripture. It is here rendered, *he that delicately bringeth up.* I rather think it ſhould be taken Paſſively, for *one that is tenderly and indulgently brought up.* Thus it is frequently taken in the neighbouring Dialects, the beſt Interpreters of words ſo ſeldom uſed. In the *Arabic*, نعّم is not only *molliter et delicatè habuit educavitque*, as מפנק here rendered; but alſo *molliter vixit, deliciatus eſt, deliciis vacavit:* whence the common phraſes, عيش ناعم *vita delicioſa et commodis affluens*; ſuch as the Young Man is here ſuppoſed to live. And جارية ناعمة, *molliter habita et educata puella*; the very Foſter-ſiſter of our tender Favourite. And that the word has the ſame ſignification among the *Chaldeans* and *Syrians*, we might prove from [a] ſeveral paſſages of their Tranſlations of the Bible, where it is ſo uſed; but we need go no farther, than to the 3d verſe of the 4th Chapter of this Book, where the former have מפנק, the latter مدلّعا, our very word, to expreſs the *Hebrew* רך, *tender*; in that ſaying, *I was my father's ſon, tender and only beloved in the ſight of my mother.*

[a] *Deut.* XXVIII; 54, 56. 1 *Sam.* XV, 32. *Neh.* IX, 25. *Cantic.* VI, 1. *Iſ.* XLVII, 8. *Jer.* VI, 2. &c.

THE next word to be conſidered is עבדו, which our Tranſlators render *his ſervant*, making it the Accuſative to מפנק. But if we may have leave to ſuppoſe the Affix to have been occaſioned by a repetition of the letter ו at the beginning of the next word ואחריתו, as it really ſeems to have been; I ſhould rather underſtand עבד as a Verb, and render it, *ſhall ſerve*, or *be in ſervitude*; or elſe, if there ſhould be any difficulty made about changing the vowels, and it ſhould ſtill be thought more proper to read it as a Noun, I ſhould take it to be of the Nominative caſe, rather than the Accuſative. And then, either underſtanding the Subſtantive Verb יהיה, or fetching it back (ὁν ἀπο κοινου) from the latter part of the ſentence where it is expreſſed, I ſhould render, *ſhall be a ſervant*; as עבד ſignifies Chap. XI, 29. And ſo the meaning of this part of the Verſe will be, *he, that is indulged from his youth, ſhall be a ſervant.*

THE ſecond Hemiſtic is, ואחריתו יהיה מנון: where we have another ἅπαξ λεγομενον, which is the laſt word מנון, rendered *ſon*; as if it was ſynonymous to בן, which ſo ſignifies. I rather take it to be a derivative, whether Participle, or Adjective, of the Verb אנן *gemuit*; the *Kametz* ſupplying the place of the *Aleph*, as it often does; and that it contains a farther deſcription of the Miſchiefs, which uſually follow a man of a ſoft and voluptuous Education: he ſhall not only *be a ſervant*; but will ſo behave himſelf in this, and every other part of life, that his אחרית or *latter End*, the whole remainder of his days, and the concluſion of them, ſhall be *deplorable*, or *miſerable*. The whole, in one view, is; *He,*

He, that is indulged from a child, ſhall be a ſervant:
And his latter end ſhall be miſerable.

If the ſuppoſing the ו, in עברו, to be an addition of the Tranſcriber, be thought too great a liberty; we may keep it, and make out the ſame ſenſe another way; and that is, by retaining the Active ſignification of מפנק, as in our Tranſlation, and underſtanding עבר tranſitively, as if it was in *Pihel*. The literal meaning of thoſe words will then be, *he that indulges* [any one] *from his youth, ſhall make him a ſervant*; which is the ſame in effect with what is above given.

And now, if the Tranſlation of this Aphoriſm, here offered, ſhould be thought ſingular; we have good authority to alledge in favour of it. Whoever will caſt his eye on the antient Verſions, will find that there is no tolerable account to be given of them, but in the way I have here taken. And I cannot but think that if the two unuſual words, מפנק and מנון, had been ſet in the light they here appear in; the modern Interpreters would have ſeen no occaſion to have varied from the Antient. I ſhall now ſet down theſe Tranſlations, with their *Polyglott*-Latin; and leave the Reader to compare them with mine, at his leiſure.

The *Arabic* is,

من يتدلّل ويتطبر منذ صباه سيكون عبداً
ويتالّم على نفسه اخيراً،

Qui molliter et delicate nutritur à pueritiâ ſuâ, erit ſervus:
Et dolebit ſuper animam ſuam poſtremò.

The *Syriac* is,

ܡܕܡܥܢܓ ܒܥܕܢܐ ܕܛܠܝܘܬܗ ܥܒܕ ܢܗܘܐ ;
ܘܒܣܘܦ ܢܬܐܒܠ ܢܗܡ ׃

Qui deliciis indulget à pueritiâ ſuâ, ſervus erit;
Et in noviſſimo ſuo ſuſpirabit.

With theſe agrees the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt, except in the laſt word מנן, which he renders מנסח *evertetur*; attending perhaps more to the Senſe, than the Letter: unleſs we may ſuppoſe מנסח to be a corruption for מתאנח (or ſome ſuch word) from אנח *gemuit*. It may be obſerved likewiſe that both here, and in the *Syriac*, the firſt word מפנק, is rendered by מתפנק; a derivitive from the ſame Radix, only of the Paſſive form: which may be a further confirmation of the account of that word above given.

Lastly: the *Greek* Verſion here is, ος καταπαπαλα εκ παιδος, ωστε εξαι εαυτου η οδυνηθησεται εφ εαυτω. i. e. *He, that is delicately brought up from a child, ſhall be a ſervant; and ſhall grieve for himſelf at laſt:* which makes a good ſenſe. And as the *Arabic* and *Syriac* (as likewiſe the *Chaldee* in the Firſt Hemiſtic) agree with it; it may be worth while to enquire, what readings the LXX found in their Copy, to juſtify their rendering. And firſt, by their underſtanding מפנק in a neutral or intranſitive ſenſe, and rendering it καταπαπαλα, they muſt be ſuppoſed to have taken it for the *Hophal*, and not for the *Hiphil*, of the Verb פנק, an απαξ λεγομενον, which ſtill retains the ſame ſenſe in the *Arabic* language, which

it

it has been juſtly thought to have in the *Hebrew*, viz. *to indulge* or *uſe tenderly*. Secondly, for עבדו, they ſeem to have read עובר *ſerviens*, making ו the ſecond, inſtead of the laſt letter; and then by ſuppoſing יחידה, which is expreſſed in the latter part of the verſe to be underſtood here, they would have their ουετος εσα. Thirdly, as for the laſt word מנן, which they render οδυνησεται, whence ſhould they have that meaning, but from אנן, which in the *Arabic* and *Syriac*, as well as in the *Hebrew*, ſignifies *to grieve*, *lament*, and *groan*. To which etymology it is no objection that מנן is not written with an א; which may have dropped out of it, as it has out of מבלת, 1 *Kings* V, 11, (25); מלפנו, *Job* XXXV, 11; מסרת, *Ezek.* 20, 37; and חסורים, *Eccleſ.* 4, 14.

THUS I have endeavoured to account for the *Greek* Verſion; which, as it exhibits a good ſenſe, and is conſiſtent with the Rules of Grammar, and has moreover the authority of the above mentioned antient Verſions on it's ſide, I take leave to ſubmit to the judgment of the Reader.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXX, 15.

לעלוקה שתי בנות הב הב׃

The horseleach hath two daughters;
crying, *Give, give.*

THE Text is one of the wise Sayings of *Agur*; which are thought to be so many Answers to several moral Questions, which had been put to him by his two Scholars, *Ithiel* and *Ucal*. In a few verses before it, they are supposed to have asked him, What share of worldly good things he thought a Competency; and prayed for, as such? To which he answers, ver. 7. *Two things have I required of thee,* (O God;) *deny me them not, before I die. Remove far from me vanity and lies; give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me* &c. And now having learnt, wherein true Satisfaction and Contentment consisted, they seem to have been desirous (as contraries explain each other) of knowing the reverse of this happy state: and (in order to put the question as strong as possible) to have asked him, What was the most insatiable Creature upon earth? To which he answers thus:

The horſeleach hath two daughters:
crying, *Give, give.*

THE word rendered *Horſeleach* is *Aluka*, which is read only in this place; and which, as it has no root in *Hebrew*, I deduce from the Arabic *alak*, to *hang*, *ſtick*, or *cling*. And by the word *Aluka* is generally underſtood, what *R. Levi*, a learned *Jewiſh* Commentator, deſcribes it to be, *A Worm, that ſucks a man's blood; and is not ſatisfied, 'till it has filled itſelf therewith to a ſurprizing degree; and then dropping off, diſcharges the blood; and ſo returns again to fill itſelf continually; never by this means to be ſatisfied.* That is, in one word, what the Latins call the *Sanguiſuga*, or *Bloodſucker*; and we, in Engliſh, the *Horſeleach*. But the learned *Bochart* (whoſe authority is allowed to have great weight on the ſubject of Animals) objects to this Tranſlation of the word; and ſays, he cannot approve of it, for two reaſons. 1. Becauſe the mention of the *Horſeleach* would be foreign to the place. 2. Becauſe the *Horſeleach*, being generated from putrefaction or corruption, cannot be ſaid to have *daughters* or *offspring*. And thus, having rejected the common acceptation of *Aluka*, he proceeds to offer one of his own. He ſays, that thoſe, who interpret the *Aluka* of the *Sanguiſuga* or *Horſeleach*, confound it with another word of pretty much the ſame ſound, *viz.* עלקה *Alaka*, the name given to the *Horſeleach* by the *Arabians* and other Eaſtern nations; whereas עלוקה *Aluka* has a quite different ſignification, being ſynonymous to the Arabic *Aluk*, which, according to the beſt Lexicons, imports *Deſtiny*,

ſtiny, Misfortune, Fate; whatever hangs over a man's head, is allotted to him, or *about to befall him* — That this is the true ſenſe of the word in the Proverb before us — That, if it ſhould ſeem ſtrange, that *Fate*, or *Deſtiny*, ſhould have *progeny* attributed to it; it is no more than what we read *Zeph.* II, 2; where the *Divine Decree* is ſaid to *bring forth*; and *Prov.* XXVII, 1; where *to-morrow* is ſaid to do the ſame: *Events* (as *Mercer* obſerves upon the latter place) being ſtiled in the *Hebrew* phraſe *the Children of Time* — That, as to the *Children* here aſſigned to *Fate* or *Deſtiny*, and which are deſcribed by their crying, *Give, give*; they are either שאול *Sheol*, i. e. *the Place of departed Souls*, and אבדון *Abaddo*, i. e. *Deſtruction*, of which it is ſaid in Chap. 27 of this Book juſt now quoted, that they are never *full* or *filled* — Or elſe, if theſe two ſhould be thought to denote the ſame thing; the Daughters are שאול, the place aforeſaid, and שחת the *Grave*: one of which is continually craving the *Soul*, the other the *Body*. Thus *Bochart*; alledging *R. Menachem*, as quoted by *R. Sol. Jarchi*, in ſupport of his opinion.

But (with the higheſt deference to ſo great a name) I cannot concur with *Bochart*, in what he offers, either for rejecting the common Tranſlation, or for eſtabliſhing his own. For, to begin with his two Reaſons againſt the common Tranſlation, I cannot think, 1. That the mention of the *Horſeleach* is ſo foreign to the ſcope of the place, as he takes it to be. On the contrary, the deſign of the ſacred Penman being (as is plain from the Context) to expoſe the vices of *Avarice, Ambition, Extortion*, and the like, I cannot ſee how he could give

a more lively deſcription of them, than under the image of the *Horſeleach*; an Animal, that has been proverbial in all ages, and amongſt all writers, for it's exorbitant *Craving* and *Inſatiability*. I ſhould rather ſuſpect his own Account to be liable to the Objection; there being not the leaſt thing either in the Context, or any other part of the Chapter, to countenance his notion of *Fate* or *Deſtiny*. 2. As for his other Reaſon for rejecting the *Horſeleach*, taken from it's being produced from *putrefaction*; I think the Queſtion about *equivocal Generation* (as the Naturaliſts call it) is now held in the negative; and if ſo, it can be no objection againſt our underſtanding the word of the *Horſeleach*, that *that Worm* is here ſaid to have *Daughters* or Offspring; ſince it muſt then propagate it's ſpecies by a true and proper generation, as all other Animals do. And thus much for his Reaſons againſt *the common* interpretation of the word.

I NOW come to conſider what he ſays, in defence of *his own*. And here he inſiſts on a nicety in Orthography; which I ſhould not mention, did he not lay ſome ſtreſs on it. He tells us, that the common name of the *Horſeleach* being written *Alaka*, without a *vau* (or *u*) in the *Arabic*, *Syriac*, and *Chaldee* languages; it is more than probable, that the *Hebrew* name of that Animal, had there been any ſuch in Scripture, would have been written ſo too; and not *Aluka*, with a *vau*, or *u*: which muſt therefore ſignify a different thing, which he will have to be *Fate* or *Deſtiny*, the ſame as the Arabic *Alúk*. This is his argument, in favour of his new Interpretation; but I think it will not bear the weight he lays upon it. I grant indeed, that the *Arabians*

bians do call the *Horſeleach* by the name of *Alaka*, from the verb *alak*, to *ſtick* or *cling*. But then his conſequence, that therefore, if the *Horſeleach* had been here intended, the word would have been written *Alaka*, and not *Aluka*, is what I cannot grant. For the letter *vau* being a *ſervile* letter, as the grammarians call it; I would ask whether the antient *Hebrews*, in forming the name of the *Horſeleach* from *alak*, had not the ſame liberty to put it in, as the *Arabians*, *Syrians*, and *Chaldeans* had to leave it out? Doubtleſs, they had, and a great deal more: otherwiſe, we muſt ſay, that the Dialects are to be the regulators of the *Original Tongue*, and not the *Original Tongue* the regulator of the *Dialects*; which is contrary to the hiſtory and cuſtom of all languages in the world. Inſtead therefore of ſaying, that the *Arabians* and the *other Oriental* People do not call the *Horſeleach* by the name of *Aluka*, therefore the *antient Hebrews* did not; it will be much more rational to ſay, that the *antient Hebrews did* call it by that name, therefore the *Arabians*, and the other *Oriental People* ſhould have done ſo too.

But, do the *Chaldeans* and *Syrians* indeed leave out the *vau*, in conformity to the *Arabians*? I believe, the contrary will be found to be the fact, even from our Author's own account of the matter. For, at the ſame time that he tells us, that the word is found *without* it in *Ferrarius*'s *Lexicon*, and in the *Theſaurus* of *Thomas à Novaria*, he confeſſes, that he finds it *with* it in the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe on *Pſ.* XII, 8; and on this preſent Text. To which he might have added the *Syriac* Tranſlation of the latter. Now, unleſs we will judge of the

Uſe

Uſe and Orthography of a word rather from what we meet with in Lexicons, than what we meet with in the Authors themſelves, from whence thoſe Lexicons were drawn; which, I am perſuaded, is what no competent judge of Language will aſſert: I think we have much greater Reaſon to conclude, that the *Chaldeans* and *Syrians* retain the *vau*, than that they omit it. Nor is the Argument, he brings from the *Talmud*, any better founded. Having obſerved in *Buxtorf*, that ſome former Edition of that Book read the word without a *vau*, he preſently concludes, that it ought to be ſo read; and then cenſures the Editors of 1645, for inſerting it. Whereas the real truth of the caſe ſeems to be; that theſe Editors, obſerving the word to be written with a *vau*, if not in the Copy from which they printed, yet in the Places above mentioned, *viz.* the *Hebrew* of this Text, (and the word occurs no where elſe in the whole Bible) in the *Chaldee* and *Syriac* Tranſlations of it, and in the *Targum* on Pſ. XII, 8, and perhaps in ſome other Books, were willing to conform their Edition to them; taking it for granted (as they juſtly might) that thoſe, who had read otherwiſe, were in the wrong. I conclude therefore, that the Objection made againſt the common Tranſlation of עלוקה, taken from it's being written with a *vau*, is of no force; but that, on the contrary, there is all the reaſon in the world to think it ſo ſignifies, becauſe it is ſo written.

As to the Authority of *R. Menachem*, I think it is ſo far from favouring his notion of עלוקה, that it quite deſtroys it. The paſſage in *R. Solomon* is, מנחם פתר כשמעו למדנו שחו ערבי; the meaning of which I take

to

to be, *Menachem expounding* (עלוקה) *in it's literal ſenſe, teaches us that it is an Arabic Word.* Where, by *literal ſenſe*, I take to be meant that of the *Horſeleach*, preſerved in the *Arabic* Root علق, to *hang* or *ſtick*; and not of *Sheol* &c. which *R. Solomon* goes on to mention, as the Expoſition of other Interpreters. And with this agrees *Giggeius*'s verſion of the paſſage; which is, *Juxta interpretationem Menachem, ut ſonat, vox hæc intelligenda, et erit vox Arabica.*

And ſo much, for the word עלוקה. But this is not the only diſpute that there has been about this Verſe. For many, who agree to underſtand *Aluka* of the *Horſeleach*, are yet divided in their opinions concerning her *Daughters*; Who, and What they are? The *Horſeleach*, ſays the Text, *hath two daughters*, crying, *Give, give.* — Who then are theſe two *Daughters?* and what are their names? and where ſhall we look for them? *Grotius* and ſome others ſay, that, the Tongue of the *Horſeleach* being forked, her *two Daughters* are the two little *Branches*, or *Spikes* thereof. But to this it is rightly objected, that, beſides the great quaintneſs and impropriety of ſtiling the *Member* of an Animal it's *Progeny*; the *Horſeleach* does not perform her ſuction by her *Tongue*, but by her *Lips*. Others by the *two Daughters of the Horſeleach* underſtand the two *Species* of that worm; the one living in the *freſh* water, the other in the *ſalt*. But to this it is ſaid, that the *Sea-Horſeleach* is not of the *Bloodſucking* kind; and ſo cannot be ſuppoſed to be here meant by *Agur*. Others connect theſe words with the following, thus, *The horſeleach has Two daughters; yea, there are Three things, that cannot be ſatisfied;*

ſatisfied; *yea Four*, *that never ſay*, *It is enough*: *the Grave*, *and the barren Womb*, *the Earth that is not filled with water*, *and the Fire that ſaith not*, *It is enough*. But againſt this Interpretation it is objected, that the *numerical* Gradation riſes a ſtep too high; for, beginning with *Two* it proceeds to *Three*, and then to *Four*; which is contrary to the uſage of Scripture, which in like caſes never advances beyond a *Unit*, by way of increment to the firſt number: as may be ſeen in thoſe places where theſe *Progreſſions* are made uſe of; as particularly at the 18th verſe of this Chapter, *There be Three things*, *which are too wonderful for me*; *yea*, *Four*, *which I know not*. It is anſwered by ſome, that, though we have no inſtance of any ſuch Addition in the Bible, it does not follow but that the *Hebrews* may have ſometimes uſed it: By others, that it is not improbable, but that the *Hebrew*, inſtead of שתי, *Two*, might formerly have read שלוש, *Three*, for the *Firſt* Number: ſince the LXX read τρεις, *Three*, rendering, τη βδελλη τρεις θυγατερες, *Sanguiſugæ tres erant filiæ*. And ſo the *Arabic* and *Syriac*, which follow them. In anſwer to which, I ſay, that admitting the *Firſt* Number to be *Three*, as the LXX read it, and the Gradation to be regular, yet I cannot think this Interpretation right: for as much as the *Four* Things, which muſt *then* be taken for the *Daughters* of the *Horſeleach*, namely, the *Grave*, the *Barren Womb*, the *Earth*, and the *Fire*, are ſuch, as cannot with any manner of propriety, nay, not even with the leaſt analogy or reſemblance, be ſo ſtiled.

I CANNOT

I CANNOT therefore agree with thoſe, who run this Sentence into the following Verſe. It is an Aphoriſm of itſelf; nor need we go beyond the Text, to look for the Daughters of the *Aluka*: we have them *here*, expreſſly mentioned; we have the very Names of them: they are in the *Hebraw* הב, הב, *Hab, Hab*; in our *Engliſh*, *Give, Give*; the very ſame, that had drawn aſide the corrupt and avaritious *Rulers of Iſrael*, (*Hoſ.* IV, 18.) who are ſaid to love הבו, *Habu*, *Give ye*. Theſe are properly ſaid to be the *Daughters* of the *Aluka*, that Emblem of *Covetouſneſs* and *Diſcontent*; the *Thoughts* of a greedy unſatisfied Mind naturally producing ſuch language. And now, leaving out the word *crying*, or *ſaying*, for which there is no foundation in the Original; and which, by putting Expoſitors upon going out of this Verſe in queſt of the *Daughters* of the *Aluka*, ſeems to have given occaſion to all the difficulties that have been raiſed about it; I render,

The horſeleach hath two daughters;
Give, Give.

AND this is the ſenſe of the *Chaldee Paraphraſt*, if permitted to ſpeak for himſelf. His *Latin* Tranſlator indeed renders, as our Verſion has it, *Sanguiſugæ duæ ſunt filiæ*, dicentes, *Da, Da*; *the Horſeleach hath two daughters*, ſaying, *Give, Give*: throwing in, as others have done, the word *dicentes*, *ſaying*, or, as we expreſs it, *crying*; for which there is no warrant in the Original *Chaldee*. It ſhould be, *Sanguiſugæ duæ ſunt filiæ, Da, Da*; *the Horſeleach hath two daughters, Give, Give*;

Give; which is word for word as I have rendered it. And ſo the Greek of *Symmachus*, Δυο θυγατερες, Φερε, Φερε, *The Horſeleach has two daughters, Bring, Bring.* And ſo ſome, though very few, of the modern Interpreters; moſt of them having, as was juſt now hinted, been led aſide by the DICENTES of the *Vulgate* to look for the two *Daughters* elſewhere, as their ſeveral fancies have directed them.* But this word is as foreign to the Original, as it is deſtructive of the Senſe of it. And thus diſincumbered of the ſuperfluous word, *Crying*, or *Saying*, the Text has the true air and turn of an Eaſtern Apophthegm; is round, and ſtriking; and worthy to be reckoned amongſt the *Words* or *Wiſe Sayings* of *Agur*, a man for Wiſdom ranked with *Solomon* himſelf.

* The LXX for רהב רהב have αγαπησει αγαπωμενη, *dilectione dilectæ*, vel *diligentes*; taking רהב, not from יהב *dedit*, but from אהב *amavit*.

OBSERVATIONS
ON
PROVERBS XXX, 17.

—וּבֶז לְיִקְהַת אֵם—

—*And despiseth to obey his mother*—

I THINK the generality of Modern Interpreters take the word לִיקְהַת in the same sense that Ours do: excepting only, that they express it by a Noun, instead of a Verb of the Infinitive-mood, rendering it *Obedience*, *Discipline*, *Government*, or the like; in the notion of the *Arabic* وَقِهَ, or وَقِهَ *paruit*, *obedivit*; there being no Root remaining in the *Hebrew*, to authorize any such acceptation. But the *Greek* of the LXX is quite different, being

—ἀτιμάζοντα γῆρας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ.

—*that dishonours the* old-age *of his mother.*

And so the *Arabic*, which follows it; as likewise the *Syriac*, and the *Chaldee* Paraphrase. Which Sense Dr. *Castell* makes no scruple to prefer to the other; as conceiving the *Corporal* Defects of *Old-Age* (such as *Crookedness*, *Wrinkles*, *Shaking of the Head* &c.) to be more

 properly

properly the Objects of the *Contemptuous Eye*, than any Infirmity belonging to the *Mind*. It may be worth while therefore, both in regard of the antiquity and authority of these Versions, as likewise of the judgment of the learned Professor, who declares his Approbation of them, to see what grounds the Authors of them may probably have had for their so rendering. The Dr. then (whose account we should first hear) is of opinion that they took the letter ל to be radical, as if they thought the word was descended from לקח, which in their times might have signified the same with the *Æthiopic* ∩υω (*labak*) *senuit*; from which it differs only by the Transposition of a letter, which in many instances in the *Hebrew* Language, makes no alteration in the sense.

Thus he. But if the letter ל be indeed radical, as he would have it to be; I would propose another Theme, from whence the word might be derived without any such *Metanbasis*, and that is the *Samaritan* לבח, (*labah*) *to consume*, which is the fatal Effect of *Old Age*.

On the contrary; *R. Solomon Jarchi*, throwing out the ל as Servile, and so making the word to be יקחת (the same which *Gen.* XLIX, 10, is commonly taken in the notion of *gathering together*, or *assembling*, from the *Chaldee* קחח, which so signifies) expounds it of the מקמטים or *Wrinkles*, which מקבצים ונקהי בפני אמו, *are collected and assembled in the Face of his Mother*. And so in his Note on the aforesaid Text of *Genesis*, the only place where it occurs but here, speaking of the signification of the word in the passage before us, he says,

ſays, that it is קבוץ קמטים שבפנה מפני זקנתיה *the Collection of Wrinkles that are on her Face on account of her Old-Age.* Where we have in expreſs terms one of thoſe *viſible* effects of *Old-Age*; which Dr. *Caſtell*, in his account of the word, would have to be underſtood.

Before I diſmiſs this word, I cannot forbear offering one Conjecture more in juſtification of theſe antient Interpreters; which is, that it is poſſible the Copies, they tranſlated from, may, inſtead of יקהרו, have read זקנו, the ordinary term whereby the *Hebrews* expreſs *Old-Age.* This paſſage would then be almoſt word for word the ſame with *Prov.* XXIII, 22: ואל תבוז כי זקנה אמך, *and deſpiſe not thy mother, when ſhe is old.*

From what has been ſaid, it appears, that the antient Tranſlators, how much ſoever they differ from thoſe who have come after them, had yet their Reaſons for rendering as they did. — And I have been thus particular, in enumerating theſe Reaſons; that the Reader might ſee that theſe Verſions, which preſent us with ſo good a Senſe, are as well founded as they are proper.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXX, 23.

תחת שנואה כי תבעל
ושפחה כי תירש גברתה׃

For an odious woman, *when ſhe is married:*
And an handmaid, that is heir to her miſtreſs.

SOME Commentators think, that the ſecond word שנואה alludes to *Deut.* XXI, 15 &c. where *Moſes*, prohibiting the Diſinheriting the Firſt-born upon private Affection, has theſe words, *If a man have two wives, one* אהובה *beloved*, and another שנואה *hated*; *and they have born him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the firſt-born ſon be her's, that was hated: then it ſhall be* &c. If the word has this Alluſion, as indeed it ſeems to have; it muſt not be rendered as an Adjective, μισητη *odious* or *hateful*, but as a Participle, μισουμενη *hated:* as *Symmachus* rightly has it. And the *Woman*, ſo denominated, will be one; who, having formerly by ſome means or other forfeited her *Huſband*'s Affections, and been obliged to reſign his Bed to another, who is אהובה, more *beloved*, has again recovered his Favour, cohabits with him (as the ſame [a] *Symma-*

[a] Και γυνη μισουμενη, ὁταν συνοικηση.

chus

chus renders the verb תבעל) and is admitted into all the rights and privileges of the Married-State: and ſo having, as ſhe is willing to think, obtained an entire conqueſt over him, and ſubjected him to her dominion (which is another notion of תבעל) is reſolved to make him ſuffer for his former Inconſtancy and Diſreſpect, by behaving herſelf in the moſt imperious and tyrannical manner both to himſelf, and all that belong to him. In which reſpect, ſhe is fit to be ranked with the poor Maid-Servant, in the next hemiſtic; who, having by her naughty Influence over her Maſter, ſupplanted her Miſtreſs, and turned her, firſt out of his Affections, and then out of his Family, (for the verb ירש ſignifies as well *to diſpoſſeſs*, as to *inherit*, and is accordingly here rendered by the LXX κβαλη) ſucceeds in her room; and (which is generally the caſe of ſuch haſty advancements) becomes as proud and inſolent, as her former condition was baſe and ſervile. The ſenſe will then be,

For the hated woman, *when reſtored to the power of a wife:*
And an handmaid, when ſhe hath diſpoſſeſſed her miſtreſs.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

PROVERBS XXX. 27.

מלך אין לארבה
ויצא חצין כלו׃

The locuſts have no king:
Yet go they forth all of them by bands.

Margin (for *by bands*) has *gathered together.*

IN theſe words we have a deſcription of one of thoſe Four Animals; which, though *little upon earth* (as they are ſtiled v. 24) are yet at the ſame time ſaid to be *exceeding wiſe*; or, as many of the [a] antient Verſions, with a great deal more emphaſis, have it, *wiſer than the wiſe*. It is the ארבה (*arbe*) a ſpecies of *Locuſts*, or *Graſhoppers*, frequently mentioned in Scripture: and ſo called, as *Aben-Ezra* gives it's etymology, מלשון רבוי, *from the notion of Number*, or *Multitude*; it being obſerved by Travellers, that in thoſe Countries, which are ſubject to be infeſted by them, they come in ſuch prodigious Swarms, or rather Clouds, that, as long as they

[a] So the LXX, σοφωτερα των σοφων· and the Vulg. *ſapientiora ſapientibus*; as alſo the *Syr.*

are

are upon the wing, they darken the very light of the Sun; and when they deſcend to the ground, they cover it to that degree, that (to uſe the ſaying of *Moſes* concerning the ſame creatures, *Exod.* X, 5) *one is not able to ſee the earth.* Nay, ſo remarkable are they for appearing in vaſt numbers; that the writers of the Old Teſtament ſeem to have looked upon כארבה *as locuſts*, and אין מספר, *without number*, as equivalent expreſſions: and * often join them together to repreſent an immenſe *Multitude* or *Army*. And it is a common Compariſon among the *Arabians* at this day, to ſay of a man that abounds in wealth, that *he has Cattle*, or *Riches*, كالدبا, as *Locuſts*, i. e. in exceeding great plenty. And from hence likewiſe very probably, as well as from the Execution they do, are they called by God (*Joel* II, 25) חילי הגדול *my great Army*; and by *Mohammed*, in one of thoſe Sayings commonly attributed to him, جند الله الاعظم, *the Army of the great God*. The Character here given of the *Wiſdom*, or *Natural Sagacity*, of this Inſect is — That, though *it has no King* (no Officer in chief, to command, or direct it's Motions) *yet it goes forth* on it's military expeditions (as the Verb יצא is obſerved often to ſignify) חצים כלם: concerning the meaning of which phraſe Commentators are greatly divided in their Opinions. Some of them, taking the word חצים in the notion of חץ a *Dart* or *Arrow*, underſtand it of the *Motion* of the Animal; and render, *Sagittarum inſtar ſe ejaculantur, they ſhoot or dart themſelves out like Arrows.* Others prefer the ſignification of קצה *to cut off* or *de-*

* As *Judg.* VI, 5; and VII, 12. *Jer.* XLVI, 23: &c.

ſtroy. So *Buxtorf*, on חצין, *excidens univerſa ipſa*. And *R. Levi* more at large, *It has no King*, שיעמיד בחסכמו אחרת והוא יצא כלו בעת מוגבל אשר יתכון לו לכריות עשבי התבואות להיותם לו למזון, *to bring them to a confederacy; and yet they go forth all together at ſuch a fixt time as they ſee convenient, to cut off the green fruits of the year, for their food*. *Aben-Ezra* gives what he takes to be the Meaning in the two words מאסוף and מקבץ *gathered together*, and *collected* or *condenſed*: which is the Senſe likewiſe of the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt; who has מתכנשין כלחון כחרא, *They are all gathered together*; as alſo of the *Syriac*, which runs in the very ſame words; and of our Tranſlators, in the Margin.

But againſt theſe Interpretations it is by ſome, and I think not without reaſon, excepted, that they do not come up to the intention of the Aphoriſm; as mentioning thoſe actions only of the *Locuſt*, which it could do as well *without*, as *with* a *King*, or Head Commander: and therefore, that there is nothing remarkable, or deſerving the notice of the Wiſe Man, in their ſo doing. Others therefore, to avoid this Objection, chooſe to derive the ſignification of חצין from חצה, to *divide* or *diſtribute*; and, to compleat the ſenſe, underſtand — ſome, *Turmas Troops* — and others, *Spolia Spoils*: ſo making the *Wiſdom* of the *Locuſts* to conſiſt; the one in their ſkilful and orderly *Marſhalling their Forces*, on their going to attack the fruits of a country; the other, in their equal and prudent *diſtributing the Booty*, after they have made themſelves maſters of it: both which things, being looked upon as conſiderable branches of the Province and Prerogative of the *King*, or ſupreme Officer, require

require more Conduct and Diſcretion than commonly falls to the ſhare of the inferior Soldiery. Of the former of theſe Opinions are our Tranſlators, who have, as we ſee in the Text, *they go forth by bands*; following therein the Vulgate, *egreditur per turmas ſuas*. Of the latter, is the famous *Bochart*, who compares this place, as ſome others do, with *Numb.* XXXI, 27; where, after the victory over the *Midianites*, the Lord commands *Moſes*, חצית את החלקוה, *divide the ſpoil in two parts*. And with him agrees the very learned [a] Mr *Albert Schultens*; though he accounts for the *Diviſion*, or *Diſtribution*, *of the Spoils* another way; which is by taking the word חצץ in the ſignification of an *Arrow*, as we above obſerved ſome to do, and making it ſynonymous to the *Arabic* words ضم زلم the *Arrows* uſed by the *Arabians* in *drawing Lots*: as that Cuſtom is at large deſcribed by *Pocock* in his *Specim. Hiſt. Arab.* p. 324 &c. So that, inſtead of *ſingulæ dividentes*, he will have it to be *ſingulæ ſortientes*; which he likewiſe confirms from the *Arabic* verb حصّ, which in the III. and VI. Conjug. ſignifies to *divide by Lot*, as alſo from the Noun حصّة, which is expreſſly *Sors*, *Lot*.

And theſe are the chief Opinions, concerning the Meaning of the word חצץ. I will beg leave to mention one more, by way of conjecture. In the neighbourhood of حصّ juſt now mentioned by Mr *Schultens*, we meet with the verb حضّ *ſtimulavit*, *incitavit*, *inſtigavit*, *cupidine accendit*, *ſuaſit*, *adhortatus eſt*; from whence حضّة

[a] See his *Animadver. Philolog.* p. 270, 271 &c. and the ſame on *Job*, p. 169 &c.

incitatio, ſuaſio, adhortatio. If we may have liberty to ſuppoſe, that ſome ſuch ſignification as this belonged to the *Hebrew* חצץ in *Agur's* time, (as why may it not?) his meaning will then be,

The locuſt hath no king:
But goeth forth to war, on the alarm of it's whole army.

I WAS the more inclined to take notice of this *Arabic* notion, becauſe it ſeems in ſome meaſure to account for the *Greek* of the LXX: which is one of thoſe antient Verſions, which *Bochart* ſays is not eaſy to be reconciled with the original *Hebrew.* It is,

Αβασιλευτον εστι ἡ ακρις:
Και εκστρατευει αφ' ἑνος κελευσματος ευτακτως.

Thus rendered by it's *Latin* Interpreter,

Sine rege eſt locuſta:
Et pergit in acie ab unâ juſſione ordinatè.

And by Dr *Pocock*, who ſeems to approve of it, thus;

They go on as in battle array, guided by one alarm, in good order: where the expreſſion αφ' ἑνος κελευσματος, on *one Alarm, Summons*, or *Orders*, is much the ſame with, *on the Alarm of it's whole* [Army], as I have given. And in this ſenſe the ſame Interpreters ſeem to have taken the word מחצצים, *Judg.* v, 11: rendering, αναχρωμενοι, from αναχρωμαι, which, according to *Conſtantine*, ſignifies, among other things, *impellere, urgere, cogere, agitare*; and, accordingly, their *Latin* Tranſlation has *agitantium.*

tium. In this view, the words חצץ כלו are very expreſſive; and give us a lively image of a well-diſciplined Army, moving on, as the *Grecians* ſay παντοδυναμει, all in a body, with united force and courage, and in the moſt exact order; *each keeping his rank*, and *none thruſting another*, as the Prophet *Joel* deſcribes their progreſs; there being as many expert Officers as there are Soldiers; all as capable of giving, as they are ready to execute, the word of command. And from this ſurprizing harmony, firmneſs, and regularity, with which they are obſerved to conduct themſelves, whether walking or flying, ſuch a Multitude of them, ſo compacted and linked together, as is in this Proverb ſuppoſed, is called by the *Arabic* writers, that have treated of them, النظام, *Almandum*; from the verb نظم, *To ſet or join together in order, as pearls in a necklace.* And for the ſame reaſon St *Jerom*, who had been an eye-witneſs of their motions, ſpeaking in the like comparative way, ſays of them, that *they keep as conſtant in their places, when they fly, as the ſtone ſquares in a checkered pavement, without any moving out of them*; to give his words in * Dr *Pocock's* tranſlation. And this I mention, as what may perhaps give ſome light into another *Greek* Verſion, which is that of *Symmachus*, who renders, Ὡς ψηφις πασα, *Ut calculus* (vel *lapillus*) *univerſa.*

* See Comment on *Joel*, p. 59; as likewiſe *Bochart, de Locuſtis.*

A

SERMON

PREACHED

BEFORE THE

UNIVERSITY OF *OXFORD*;

UPON

MATTHEW II, 23.

A SERMON

ON

MATT. II, latter Part of 23.

—He ſhall be called a NAZARENE.

---ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ ΚΛΗΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ.

The whole Verſe runs thus:

And he came, and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled, which was ſpoken by the prophets, *He ſhall be called a Nazarene.*

AS the exact Correſpondence between the Old Teſtament and the New, between the Events foretold in the one, and accompliſhed in the other, hath been juſtly looked upon by Chriſtian Believers as one of the ſtrongeſt Arguments of the Truth of their Religion; ſo is there nothing which the obſtinate and incredulous *Jews* have appeared more jealous of, or more forward to diſpute, than the Validity of this important Proof. They well know, that if Chriſtianity be really built upon the Foundation of the *Prophets*, as well as the Apoſtles; and if Jeſus Chriſt be *the chief Corner-ſtone* of the *Old*, as well as of the New Teſtament; the Religion thus founded will prove a Fabric

too ſecure for their deepeſt contrivance to undermine, and too ſtrong for their moſt powerful malice to overthrow. 'Tis the Ground-work therefore of the Chriſtian Syſtem, the Harmony of the Two Covenants, that they labour to deſtroy: the New Teſtament, they pretend, is *independent* on the Old: and our bleſſed Saviour, notwithſtanding his Miracles, is by them arraigned as an Impoſtor, for attempting to prove his *Meſſiahſhip* from *the Law* and *the Prophets*. In order hereunto, the ſeveral paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which are cited by him and his Apoſtles in confirmation of their doctrine, are repreſented as induſtriouſly perverted, and impertinently applied: and the arguments, drawn from thoſe paſſages, are cenſured as ſophiſtical, inconcluſive, and abſurd. And, leſt trifling and equivocation ſhould be thought too ſlight a charge to fix on our Lord and his Diſciples; forgery and falſhood are imputed to them likewiſe. They are brought in, as *inventing* Prophecies to ſerve a turn; and as quoting Texts from the Old Teſtament, which are no where to be found therein. This is the engine, which *Jewiſh* Adverſaries are continually levelling againſt the Walls of our Sion. And it would have been ſtrange indeed, if the ſame objection had not been urged by the *Deiſts* likewiſe; embarked, as they are, with the *Jews* in their common cauſe of Oppoſition to Chriſtianity. And accordingly, 'tis well known, how fierce, though artful, an Attack was made not many years ago upon our Evangeliſt, and upon this, amongſt other paſſages, of his Goſpel, by an Infidel of our own Country; whoſe Book, though written with the moſt hoſtile intention to Chriſtianity, has proved of real Service to it: having

cauſed

cauſed *The Argument from* PROPHECY to be more thoroughly conſidered, and of courſe better underſtood, than it was before.

To give a full repreſentation of this Author's ſcheme, and to exhibit each part of it in it's proper deformity, would be a longer task, than the preſent opportunity will permit me to undertake. His deſign, ſo far as it relates to my preſent purpoſe, is, to ſhew, That the Citations made by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, out of the Prophetical Writings, are either *not contained* therein; or That, if they *are* therein contained, it is in a Senſe entirely foreign to the matter, for which they are produced. Of paſſages thus falſely or impertinently alledged, he gives us five inſtances, whereof this Text of St *Matthew* is one. It ſhall therefore be my buſineſs, in this Diſcourſe, to vindicate the Conduct of the Evangeliſt from this aſperſion. And this I ſhall do,

I: BY offering ſome general Conſiderations on the Subject; and ſhewing, how highly improbable it is, that our Lord and his Apoſtles ſhould quote *any Prophecy*, as contained in the Old Teſtament, which was not actually therein contained. And,

II: By taking up this particular Paſſage of St *Matthew*; and ſhewing, that what he here alledges to have been ſpoken by the Prophets, was, and is, ſo ſpoken.

I: THEN, I am to offer ſome general Conſiderations on the Subject before us; and ſhew, how highly improbable it is, that our Lord and his Apoſtles ſhould quote

any Prophecy as contained in the Old Teſtament, which was not actually therein contained. And here I might tell the Sceptic, that our Saviour, being God by Nature, muſt have perfectly known both what Prophecies belonged to him, and how to apply them: that the ſame Holy Spirit, which directed the *Prophets* in the Delivery of theſe Prophecies, directed the *Apoſtles* in their Reaſonings from them: that Chriſtianity was a Religion of ſuch conſummate purity, as learned the uſe of any indirect methods for its propagation and eſtabliſhment; and the like. But theſe being Arguments more proper to be addreſſed to a *Chriſtian*, a title, which the Sceptical Diſputer may think a reflection on his ſuperior Underſtanding: I ſhall wave them with the bare mention; and apply myſelf to him under a character, which I preſume, he will be better pleaſed with, becauſe it is what this ſort of men are apt to claim an excluſive right to; I mean that of a *Reaſoner*. As ſuch then, let him be pleaſed to conſider, how it was poſſible for any ſuch falſe Quotations, as he contends for, to be made.

OUR Saviour and his Diſciples were now introducing their Religion into the world. A ſubſtantial Proof of this their Religion they profeſſed to fetch from the Prophetical Writings. The Perſons, to whom this ſort of Proof was chiefly to be propoſed, were *Jews*, at that time the Proprietors and Guardians of theſe Writings. This People, inſtructed by theſe Books, were now in Expectation of a certain eminent *Deliverer*; who ſhould ſubdue their Enemies, and do great things for their Church and Nation. Nor did their Scriptures furniſh them only with a bare Intima-

tion,

tion, whereby they might *Expect*, but alſo with a clear Deſcription, whereby they might *Know*, this their approaching Benefactor. His Character was there drawn at full length; and very minute Circumſtances of his Life and Actions were either Preſigured, or Foretold. The *Types*, and *Prophecies*, concerning him were not concealed from common Notice; nor were they wrapt up in a ſtrange Language, or confined to the Inſpection of the Prieſt, like ſo many *Sybilline* Oracles, or *Romiſh* Bibles. They were the daily ſubject both of their Public Service, and Private Meditation. They were familiar in their Hands, and recorded in their Hearts: and the Study of them was not only the Employment and Learning, but the Glory and Perfection, of their fineſt Wits. Thus expreſs concerning the Meſſiah were the Jewiſh Scriptures; and thus diligent were the People in ſearching them.

As their Hopes grew ſtronger, their Diligence increaſed. The great Period, when moſt of theſe Prophecies were to receive their Completion, now approached. Falſe *Chriſts* began to appear: The People were alarmed; the Prieſts were jealous, and the *Sanhedrim* vigilant. And was this a Seaſon for *Coining* New Prophecies? Would our Lord and his Diſciples endanger the Succeſs of their Miniſtry, by ſuch a bare-faced Impoſture as this? Or would the *Jews* be cheated into a Belief, that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah* promiſed in their Books, by Quotations in their Books no where to be found? Had they read, explained, and compared their Scriptures, for this? Was this the End of all their Enquiry, their Solicitude, their Vigilance, their Fear? Let the Sceptical Reaſoner think ſo, if he can. And if he doth

doth not tremble at the *Impiety*, let him at leaſt acknowledge the *Abſurdity*, of the Suppoſition!

AND thus much may ſuffice to ſhew, in general, how highly improbable it is, that our bleſſed Lord and his Apoſtles ſhould quote *any Prophecy* as contained in the Old Teſtament, which was not actually therein contained.

I now proceed, as I propoſed,

II. To take up this particular Paſſage of St. Matthew, *He ſhall be called a Nazarene*; and ſhew, That what the Evangeliſt here alledges to have been ſpoken by the Prophets, was, and is, ſo ſpoken.

HERE then, in the firſt place, I intreat your attention to the following obſervation upon the Context, as of the greateſt Service to this Enquiry: which is, That the Evangeliſt doth not introduce this Paſſage as the Prophecy of a *ſingle Prophet*, but as delivered (διὰ τῶν Προφητῶν) by THE PROPHETS, in the plural Number. As therefore we are not confined to look for this Text in any *one* particular Book of Prophetical Scripture; nay, as we are clearly directed to look for it in *more than one*: ſo have we, of courſe, liberty to extend our ſearch through *all*. And if, upon enquiry, we ſhould find, that the then Future Condition of the *Meſſiah*, as repreſented by the *Generality* of the Prophets, or at leaſt by *more than one* Prophet, was to be ſuch, as ſhould entitle him to the Character of a *Nazarene*, as that word will hereafter be explained; we may then fairly conclude,

conclude, that the Prophecy before us is actually contained in the Old Teſtament, and that the Evangeliſt's Application thereof was juſt.

IN the next place, I obſerve, from the Text itſelf, That what we call *Nazarene* in Engliſh is written in Greek in the New Teſtament two ways, Ναζαρηνος and Ναζωραιος: That the form Ναζαρηνος is ſuch as cannot ſignify any thing elſe, but an Inhabitant, or Native, or (in the general) *one of Nazareth:* but that the form Ναζωραιος much reſembles the Hebrew Participle *Nazûr*, and may ſignify ſomething elſe beſides an Inhabitant of Nazareth, though perhaps that alſo: and that therefore the Evangeliſt, when inſtead of Ναζαρηνος, which is applicable only to an Inhabitant, he put Ναζωραιος, which is applicable to ſomething elſe, did probably intend ſomething elſe beſides ſuch Inhabitant.

IT has alſo been often obſerved, that the other word of our Text, Κληθησεται, *he ſhall be called* [a], is here, as well as elſewhere, equivalent to Εσται, *he ſhall be.* So that if we can find Authority for *one* of theſe words in the Prophetical Writings, we need not be ſolicitous about the *other*; ſince every Prophet, who ſhall inform us, that the *Meſſiah* was to *be* a *Nazarene*, will, in conſequence thereof, inform us, that he was to *have*, or *be entitled* to, the *Name* of one.

[a] *Vocari* idem valet quod *Eſſe* vel *Exiſtere*; ut *Iſai.* lvi, 7. *Domus mea domus orationis* vocabitur; pro quo *Luc.* xix, 46: *Domus orationis vos eſt, erit, habebitur.* Gen. xxi, 12. *In Iſaac* vocabitur *tibi ſemen*, id eſt, *erit.* Mede's Works, edit. 4. pag. 465. See likewiſe p. 445.

THESE

THESE are the Obſervations, which are principally neceſſary for directing us upon this Subject; and it is a Subject, not more remarkable for it's own great Importance, than for the Perplexity and Oppoſition of thoſe who have commented thereupon.

VARIOUS indeed have been the Opinions both of antient and modern Divines, concerning the true Senſe of this Prophecy. I ſhall mention the chief of theſe, together with ſuch Objections as they ſeem liable to; after which, I ſhall humbly preſume to offer my own Sentiments.

THE firſt I ſhall mention is that of St Chryſoſtom; who introduces his Homily on the place by asking, *Which of the Prophets has thus ſpoken?* This he ſays, not to cenſure, but in order to juſtify the Citation; not as a prejudiced Caviller, but as a fair Expoſitor. For he immediately replies, *'Tis in vain to ſearch; for many of the Prophetical Books are loſt:* intimating that this was once a part of the Jewiſh Bible; though the Book, in which it was contained, be now no more. This is an Anſwer, which many a good and ſober Chriſtian has acquieſced in, and which indeed the moſt learned and inquiſitive Critics have allowed it's weight. Time, we know, is a general devourer; and Books, as well as the Authors of them, ſooner or later, become a prey to it's teeth. Fragments of Plato and Ariſtotle, and other the beſt Heathen Writers, are ſtill extant and admired in quotation; though the excellent pieces, from whence they were taken, be long ſince ſunk in the abyſs of ages, and buried in oblivion. This, I ſay, is a Reply, that hath been made to the holy *Fathers'* Queſtion,

Queſtion, both by himſelf and other Interpreters; and which hath been eſteemed by ſome a very ſatisfactory one. Though others, and I think with good reaſon, have looked upon it rather as a pious, than ſolid, account. For, ſay they, If ſuch Prophetical Books be loſt; when were they loſt? Was it *before* the Evangeliſt wrote, or was it after? Not *before* he wrote. He would not then have cited them. He would not have laid ſo much ſtreſs on a ſcrap of a *loſt* Prophet, as even to have mentioned it. There was no occaſion he ſhould. There is, in his Goſpel, matter abundantly ſufficient to prove his point; which was to ſhew, That *Jeſus* was The *Meſſiah*. Beſides, the paſſage before us, as was above obſerved, is not repreſented as the Prediction of *one* Prophet, but of *ſeveral*. So that to ſuppoſe it not extant in the *Jewiſh* Code, when the Evangeliſt applied it, is to ſuppoſe that there had been a ſhipwreck of a Number of the Prophetical Writings: a Preſumption this, which there is not the leaſt Authority in the *Jewiſh* Hiſtory to ſupport.

To what I have ſaid in proof that this Text could not be a part of a *loſt* Prophet at the time of it's quotation, it is objected, That the very manner in which it is introduced, viz. with a ῥηθεν, *it was ſpoken*, inſtead of γεγραπται, *it was written*, ſhews it to have been an *unſcriptural* and *traditionary* Prophecy. To which I anſwer, That then the Prophecies of *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, and *Hoſea* muſt likewiſe be *unſcriptural* and *traditionary*; ſince Citations are made from all theſe Prophets after the very ſame manner, and in the very ſame words, as are uſed in alledging the paſſage before us: from the

former, at the 22d verſe of the preceding Chapter; from the two latter, at the 15th and 17th of this. Nay, then all the other paſſages, cited or mentioned by this Evangeliſt with a πληρ, which are obſerved to be no fewer than nine or ten more, will be alſo *unſcriptural* and *traditionary*; an inference, which no one, that is converſant in his Bible, will allow.

I MIGHT go on to ſhew the weakneſs and abſurdity of this Objection, from the near affinity there is between the words *ſaid* and *written* in all languages; from the promiſcuous uſe of the verbs λεγειν and γραφειν in the beſt *Greek* Authors; and the like. But I do not think the thing to be of that conſequence, as to purſue it any further; nor ſhould I have mentioned it, but that I have obſerved a good deal of ſtreſs to be laid upon it by ſome Commentators.

I CONCLUDE, that the Prophetical Books, out of which our Text was taken, were not loſt *before* the Evangeliſt wrote. Neither have they been loſt *ſince* he wrote. If they had, ſome account would certainly have been given of it either by the *Chriſtian*, or by the *Jew*: by the *Chriſtian*, had the *Jew* occaſioned ſuch a Loſs; by the *Jew*, had the *Chriſtian* been the Author of it; by both, had it been owing to any common Accident, as to Fire, Hoſtile Incurſion, or the like. But no ſuch Account has been given us by either: not by the *Jew*, who with the Judaizing Sceptic contends that it is a mere Forgery; not by the *Chriſtian*, who looks for it among the preſent Prophets.

THERE

THERE have indeed been ſome Chriſtians of Piety and Learning, who, upon the Authority of the Writer above-named, have *mentioned* ſuch a *Loſs* of Prophetical Writings; but then, like him too, they have *but mentioned* it, without giving us any tolerable Account *How*, and *When*, it happened. Which ſince they have not done; and ſince either *They*, or the *Jews*, or *Both*, would certainly have done it, had they known any Proof of it; *We* have much better reaſon to *Deny*, than *They* had to *Aſſert*, the Fact. And though, from the inſtances of *Jannes and Jambres*, and *Michael's Diſpute with the Devil*, it has been collected by ſome, that ſeveral Paſſages have ſlipt out of the *Jewiſh* Scripture, ſince the days of the Apoſtles; yet has this Difficulty been much better accounted for by others, who have obſerved, that theſe two ſtories are ſtill extant, and that probably in the very Places from whence the Apoſtles cited them; the Former in the *Targum*, and the Latter in *Zachariah*. I conclude therefore, that as the Prophetical Books, out of which our Text was taken, were not Loſt *before* the Evangeliſt wrote, ſo neither have they been Loſt *ſince* he wrote; and conſequently are *ſtill* Extant.

AND ſo much for the *Firſt* Opinion; which was, That the Prophecies, from whence St Matthew quoted the Words of my Text, are *Loſt*.

THE *Second* Opinion I ſhall produce concerning our Text, is, That the Evangeliſt here ſtiles our Lord a *Nazarene* from the Word *Netzar*; which is by the Prophets applied to their *Meſſiah*, and ſignifies a *Branch*, *Bud*, or *Flower*. This too is a notion, which has much

prevailed amongſt Commentators. The Sum of what they have advanced concerning it is This. *Nazareth*, from whence our Saviour is ſuppoſed to take the title Ναζωραιος, was, it ſeems, a place ſo fertile of *Shrubs* and *Trees*, that it was called the *Garden*, or *Flower*, of *Galilee*; borrowing it's Name, as 'tis thought, from the Hebrew *Netzar*, which (as we ſaid) denotes a *Branch* or *Flower*. Now, it appears from the Prophets, that one of the Names, whereby the *Meſſiah* was foretold to the World, was likewiſe that of *the Branch*. He is called by *Jeremiah The righteous Branch*; and by *Zechariah*, *The Man, whoſe Name is the Branch*: which places the *Targum* explains of the *Meſſiah*. And, becauſe the original word for *Branch* in theſe Paſſages is *Tſemach*, which bears no Analogy in ſound to *Nazareth*; they bring one of the ſame ſignification from *Iſaiah*, which has an evident Analogy thereto, viz. *Netzar*; which the Chaldee likewiſe interprets of the *Meſſiah*. And from hence they preſume, that the other Texts, in which the Sound is not ſo near, do likewiſe allude to the *Flowery* Town of *Nazareth*. The Text of *Iſaiah* is, *There ſhall come a Rod out of Jeſſe, and a Branch* (Netzar) *ſhall grow out of his Roots*, &c. From whence they thus argue: The *Meſſiah* is here deſcribed by the word *Netzar*, a *Branch*: That word gives denomination to a Town remarkable for *Branches*: Conſequently, our Saviour, when he came and dwelt in that Town, proved himſelf to be the Prophetical *Branch*.

THIS, if I miſtake not, is the Subſtance of what is uſually obſerved concerning the Word *Netzar*, and it's Application

Application to our Ναζωραιος. But, with due Deference to the Sentiments of thoſe who have ſo obſerved, there are divers Things which hinder me from acquieſcing in this Account. For, though I allow, that the *Meſſiah* is meant in ſome places where the Word *Netzar* does occur; yet can I not think, that the Evangeliſt had that Word in his Eye, when he ſtiled our Lord a *Nazarene*. For, Firſt, It is confeſſed that *Iſaiah* is the *Only* Prophet, who calls the *Chriſt* by the Name *Netzar*; whereas, if there be any Weight in what has been above obſerved, our Lord, according to St Matthew, is called the Ναζωραιος by more Prophets than one, δια των Προφητων. 'Tis true, the *Meſſiah* is called *Tſemach*, a word pretty nearly equivalent in Senſe to *Netzar*, by more Prophets than One. But then the Alluſion here ſuppoſed being chiefly *Verbal*, and there being not the leaſt Similitude of Sound between the Words *Tſemach* and Ναζωραιος; I cannot think that the Word *Tſemach* will be of that Service to this Opinion, which is imagined.

I SAID, that the Alluſion of *Netzar* to *Nazareth* was chiefly *Verbal*; which ſuggeſts to me a *Second* Reaſon, why I am not ſatisfied with the preſent Account of the Text, which is, that there is no *Real* Foundation for the Application. When our Lord is denominated the *Branch* by the Prophets; 'tis with Reference to the *Family*, from whence he was to *ſpring*, and not to the *Country*, where he was to *dwell*: 'tis to denote that he was to be a Deſcendant from the Houſe of *David*, and *not* that he was to be an Inhabitant of the Town of *Nazareth*. So that the Analogy contend-

ed

ed for will be at the beſt but *Nominal* and *Equivocal*. Nor will the *Stem* of *Jeſſe*, without great Force, be tranſplanted from the *Family* of *David* to the Gardens of *Nazareth*; nor, without the ſame Violence, be carried back from the *Gardens* of Nazareth to the *Family* of *David*.

MOREOVER, the Plantations of *Nazareth*, as deſcribed by the Favourers of this Opinion, do not ſeem to be a Proper Soil for the Reception of the Prophetical *Branch*. The ſame Holy Seer, who gives him the title of *Netzar*, the *Branch*, gives us alſo a Character of the Ground out of which it was to ariſe. *He ſhall grow up*, ſays he, *as a tender Plant, and as a Root out of a* DRY (or, as it may be rendered, a *ſapleſs, barren*) *Ground*. So that by how much the more *Bloomy, Fertile*, and *Gay*, they make the Incloſures of *Nazareth*; by ſo much the leſs will they adapt them to the condition of the *Poor, Tender, Humble* Twig, that was to be there raiſed up.

A *Third* Opinion concerning our Text is, That our Lord is here called a *Nazarene* in alluſion to the *Hebrew* word *Nazir*; which gave denomination to the *Nazirites* of the Old Teſtament, and ſignifies *Separated* or *Holy*. Of theſe *Nazirites* the moſt remarkable were *Sampſon*, and *Samuel*; to whom ſome have added a Third, *viz. Joſeph*, though intitled to that Character not ſo much from his Profeſſing, as from his Imitating, the *Nazaretical* Life. Theſe Perſons, from the *Similitude* of the Name, and the *Strictneſs* of the Sect, have been looked upon as Typical of Jeſus of *Nazareth*;

and

and every particular Circumſtance of their Lives has been compared, in order to conſtitute the Repreſentation. But if we could allow, that theſe Men were Types of our Bleſſed Saviour; yet ſhould we not think them to be ſuch, as they were *Called Nazirites*, but ſo far as they were *True Iſraelites*: not as they had *Vowed* a Good Life, but as they *Led* one. Our Lord himſelf was no *Nazirite*, by Profeſſion; nor could he properly be ſo called. His Public Way of Life ſuited not with ſuch a Separate Condition. As he propoſed the Good of All, ſo he freely converſed with All: and was ſo far from keeping that *Ordinary* Diſtance from the reſt of Mankind, which the People of his Nation obſerved; that he graciouſly vouchſafed to admit even Publicans and Sinners themſelves to the Audience of his Precepts, and the Benefit of his Company. So that the Alluſion of *Nazarite* to *Nazarene*, and all that is built upon it, drops at once; and we may as well look upon *David*, or any other Good Man, though not of the *Naziritical* Order, to be he Prefigurative of Jeſus of *Nazareth*, as any of the Perſons above mentioned, who have been diſtinguiſhed by that Appellation.

OTHERS therefore, apprehenſive of the Weakneſs of this Conjecture, endeavour to ſupport it by the Authority of the Prophets; and ſtill contend, that our Lord was denominated a *Nazarene* from the Word *Nazar*, though he were neither a *Nazirite* himſelf, nor bore any Relation to that Sect. Their Argument is this. The Word *Nazar*, as was obſerved of it's Derivative, ſignifies to *ſeparate*, or *dedicate to Holy Uſe*. It appears from the

the Prophetical Writings, that the *Meſſiah* was to be a Perſon of Eminent Sanctity. He is called, by the Pſalmiſt, *the Holy One*; and by Daniel, *the Moſt Holy*. It appears, from the New Teſtament, that *Holineſs* was the Diſtinguiſhing Character of our Saviour. St *Mark* calls him *the Holy one of God*; and St *Paul* very appoſitely ſtiles him *an High Prieſt, Holy, and Separate from Sinners*. It will from hence follow (ſay they) that an Epithet, borrowed from the Word *Nazar*, may not improperly be applied to *Chriſt*; and that the *Evangeliſt* might probably have had ſome ſuch Epithet in View, when, in the Name of the Prophets, he terms him a *Nazarene*.

I ANSWER, That This, as well as the Former Account, proceeds rather upon the *Similitude* of the Word, than the *Reaſon* of the Thing. It is granted, that the *Meſſiah*, as deſcribed by the Prophets, was to be a very *Pious* and *Holy* Perſon, It is granted likewiſe, that our Lord's Converſation was in all reſpects correſpondent to that Deſcription. But the Conſequence, That he was *therefore* called a *Nazarene*, is what cannot ſo eaſily be granted. For, what Connexion is there between the Prophecies produced, and the Completion contended for? Becauſe it was Foretold that our Saviour was to to live an *Holy* Life; ſhall we look on the Prediction to have been Fulfilled by his Living at *Nazareth*? Had *Nazareth* indeed been a Place dedicated to *ſacred* Contemplation, or famous for *Religious* Retirement; there might have been ſome Foundation for the Alluſion. But we do not find that it was at all more remarkable for the *Piety*, than for the *Wiſdom*, of it's Inhabitants.

Nay,

Nay, if there be any weight in *Nathanael*'s Queſtion; it will appear little leſs than a *Paradox* to *ſuppoſe*, that *any Good thing* ſhould come out of *Nazareth*. Whatever Streſs therefore has been laid on the word *Nazar*, as denoting either a *Nazirite* in particular, or any *Holy* Perſon in general; and whatever Pains have been taken, to account for St Matthew's Ναζωραιος from it: we may conclude, that the Correſpondence is at beſt but *Verbal*; and that the ſuppoſed Type or Prophecy hath no other Relation to it's pretended Antitype or Completion, than as the Terms, in which they are expreſſed, happen to conſiſt of near the ſame Letters, and to reſemble one another in Sound.

However, to do juſtice to the word *Nazar*; I muſt not diſmiſs it, without remarking, that it well deſerves the Notice, which has been taken of it on this occaſion. For though I cannot, by any means, acquieſce in either of the accounts, that have been above given of it; yet I am apt to think that, had we a perfect Knowledge of it, and underſtood it's Meaning in it's full Extent and Latitude, it would help us much in our preſent Enquiry. My reaſon, for ſo thinking, will appear from my own Conjectures on the Text; which I now beg leave to offer.

But, before we proceed, we are to diſtinguiſh between Things prophecied of in *Expreſs Words*, and in the *Subſtance* and *Senſe*. That this Text of St *Matthew* is not any where in the Old Teſtament delivered *in ſo many Words*, is readily allowed: That it is however, in *Subſtance* and *Senſe*, therein frequently contained,

muſt be inſiſted on. That the term NAZARENE occurs in any of the Prophetical Writings, no one will affirm: That we have, however, juſt Reaſon, from the Prophetical Writings, to affirm that our Lord was to be ſuch a one, as might fitly be ſtiled a NAZARENE, is what I hope to make appear: and, conſequently, that our Evangeliſt, when he declared the Prophets had ſaid that he ſhould be *ſo ſtiled*, or *ſo be*, was neither deceived himſelf (as the Sceptical Reaſoner would inſinuate), nor intended to deceive his Reader.

THIS is no imaginary, or arbitrary Diſtinction of my own Contrivance; but is founded on the Methods of Citation ſometimes made uſe of by the Apoſtles, and confirmed by the Obſervations both of Antient and Modern Expoſitors. St Paul ſays, It is written of the *Second Adam*, that he ſhall be made *a Quickning Spirit*. But *where* is it thus written? St *Chryſoſtom* anſwers, "No where;" and intimates, that this was rather a *known Character* of the Meſſiah, which had been collected out of the Prophetical Writings in *general*, and was to be verified in the Event, than any *particular Prediction*, *expreſsly* contained in the Old Teſtament, and thence *Literally* quoted by the Apoſtle. And the ſame *Father*, introducing his Comment on 1 *Corinth.* ii, 9 in his uſual manner, with a Πᾶ γέγραπται, *where is it written?* Anſwers, The *Senſe*, indeed, is contained in the Scripture-Hiſtory, but the *Words* are not. And exactly to the ſame Purpoſe, St *Jerom* on our Text. "*Had the Evangeliſt*," ſays he," "alledged any *fixed* "Example out of the Scriptures, he would not have "ſaid, *That it was ſpoken by the* PROPHETS; *but ſimply*, "*That*

"*That it was ſpoken by the* PROPHET: but now by uſing "*Prophets*, in the Plural Number, he makes it plain, "that he does not take the *Words* from the Scriptures, "but the *Senſe*." And ſo *Beza*, and *Grotius*, and other modern Interpreters.

THOUGH therefore the *Word* Ναζωραιος *Itſelf* ſhould not appear to have been attributed to the *Meſſiah* by any *particular* Prophet; yet, if it's genuine *Meaning* be ſuch, as ſhall evidently appear to have been attributed to him by More than One; we may, I conceive, rationally conclude, that it has by More than One been Foretold, That he ſhould be Ναζωραιος *a Nazarene*.

I TAKE the Word *Nazur*, or (with a Greek termination) Ναζωραιος, to be the Participle Paſſive of the Hebrew Verb *Nazar* abovementioned; which, as I ſaid, ſignifies *Separate*, or *Recluſe*. But, becauſe, as I likewiſe obſerved, our Saviour's *Public* Way of living ſuited not with the Notion of ſuch a *Separate*, *Sequeſtered* State; I rather prefer the learned Dr *Lightfoot*'s Account of the Word, who ſays that Ναζωραιος does not ſo much ſignify the *Privacy*, as the MISERY of our Saviour's Condition; and that he was probably ſo called, to denote that he was *eſtranged from*, and rejected by other Men; one *expoſed to Contempt, and held unworthy* of Human Society.

WITH this Senſe will agree the Acceptation of the Word in the Neighbouring Languages. In theſe it ſignifies, in one Form, not only to become a *Nazirite*, as in the Hebrew; but alſo, To be *Small*, *Inconſiderable*,

Worthleſs, *Vile*: in another, To *Diſeſteem*, *Depreciate*, *Moleſt*, *Affront*: in another, *Contempt*, *Ignominy*, *Diſgrace*: in another, To be *cloathed in mean Apparel*, and to be *debarred the Pleaſures and Enjoyments of Life*: Laſtly; in another, To be of a *Squalid*, *Meagre*, *Unſeemly Complexion*; and that, not through Neglect of *Cleanlineſs*, or *Decency*, but on account of *Poverty*, or Sickneſs, or ſome other *Affliction*: in a Word, To be in a Condition every way *Unfortunate* and *Deplorable*.

I MAKE no queſtion, then, but the Word *Nazar*, or, as the Greeks pronounce it, Ναζωραιος, ſignifies not only to be *Separated*, and *Sequeſtered* from other Men, but alſo, To be *Hated*, *Reviled*, *Perſecuted*, and *Afflicted* by them. If therefore we can prove from the Old Teſtament, that the *Meſſiah*, as deſcribed by the Prophets, *was* to be a *Deſpiſed*, *Perſecuted*, *Afflicted* Perſon; if it ſhall appear from the Goſpel-Hiſtory, that his *Dwelling at Nazareth* was one great *Occaſion* of theſe his Perſecutions and Afflictions: it will then follow, that it *was ſpoken by the Prophets*, that our Saviour *ſhould be* Ναζωραιος: That the General Uſage, he met with here upon Earth, ſhewed that he actually *was* Ναζωραιος: that this Character was in a *Particular* manner applicable to him, when his Father Joſeph, out of fear of *Archelaus*, carried him to Nazareth: and, that, conſequently, the *Evangeliſt* did *Then* very juſtly apply it to Him.

THAT the *Meſſiah* was *to be* a Perſon remarkable for his *Sufferings*: and that *our Meſſiah was* a very ſignal *Sufferer*; are Truths, which no one, that has looked into the Prophetical and Evangelical Writings, can diſ-

pute.

pute. OUGHT *not Chriſt to have ſuffered theſe Things?* was a Queſtion, which our Saviour more than once propoſed to his Diſciples, after he had drunk the bitterest Cup of his Afflictions. And, leſt They ſhould be at a loſs what to anſwer; he goes on to aſſure them, from the *Law of Moſes*, the *Pſalms*, and *the Prophets*, that *Thus it was written*, and *Thus it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer*. Taking it therefore for granted that our Lord was to be a *Suffering* Perſon, and that he *did* accordingly *ſuffer*; I might at the ſame time conclude, that he *was* to diſtinguiſh himſelf by the Character of Ναζωραιος, and that he *did in fact* ſo diſtinguiſh himſelf.

BUT, to make the matter ſtill clearer, I believe it may be ſhewn, that the Term Ναζωραιος will not only be applicable to our Saviour, as he was a *Sufferer* in general; but that it will likewiſe in a ſurprizing manner ſuit all the ſeveral Inſtances of his Sufferings, ſo that probably no other Word could ſo perfectly do it. To give ſome Inſtances. Was it Foretold that the *Meſſiah* ſhould be a *Stranger to his Brethren, and an Alien to his Mother's Children?* This was Fulfilled in our *Saviour*; when he was *Rejected* by the *Jews*, and *Denied* and *Forſaken* by his Diſciples and Friends: and this is expreſſed by the Word *Nazar*, which ſignifies in the Preſent Hebrew, to *Separate*, *Eſtrange*, or *Alienate*: it is therefore clear both from the Prediction and the Event, that he was Ναζωραιος. Was it Foretold by one Prophet, that his Enemies ſhould *Pierce his Hands and his Feet*; and by another, *that they ſhould look on him, whom they had Pierced?* This was eminently Fulfilled in the *Nails and Spear*, the barbarous Inſtruments of his Execution.

And

And this, the *Syrians* will tell us, is contained in their Word *Nazar*, which ſignifies to *Cleave*, *Pierce*, or *Perforate*. It is therefore again manifeſt, both from the Prophecy and the Accompliſhment, that he was Ναζωραιος in this Senſe. Was it Foretold, that the *Plowers ſhould Plow on his Back, and make long Furrows?* This *was Fulfilled, when Pilate delivered him to be ſcourged:* and this likewiſe is implied in the Term *Nazar*, which ſignifies, To *Cut*, *Lacerate*, or *Furrow*. As it was therefore Foreſhewn, ſo it came to paſs; Our Lord was in this Senſe alſo Ναζωραιος. Was it Foretold, that he ſhould *grow up as a Root out of a dry Ground?* This was Fulfilled in his being *Born* at *Bethlehem*, and Educated at *Nazareth*, the two *Smalleſt* and Pooreſt Towns of their reſpective Tribes. And this again is comprehended under the Word *Nazar*, which ſignifies in Arabic, To *be Small*, *Inconſiderable*, *Barren*. It will therefore from hence alſo follow, that our Lord was *Expected* under the Character of Ναζωραιος, and that he accordingly *Appeared* under that Character. Once more, and to have done with the Application; Was it Foretold by the Evangelical Prophet, That the *Meſſiah* was to be a Perſon of *no Form* or *Comelineſs*, of *no Beauty* whereby he might *be deſired:* That he was *Deſpiſed* and *Rejected of Men*; *a Man of Sorrows*, and *acquainted with Grief:* That he was *Wounded for our Tranſgreſſions*, and *Bruiſed for our Iniquities?* All theſe Calamities and Afflictions, the Evangeliſts will tell us, Our Saviour laboured under: And all theſe are comprized in the Term *Nazar*, as above explained. We may therefore infer, that in all theſe reſpects our Lord was both *to Be*, and *actually Was*, Ναζωραιος.

I MIGHT

I MIGHT eaſily carry the Compariſon through the Whole Series of our Saviour's Sufferings; and ſhew, that there is ſcarce a ſingle Circumſtance of his Paſſion, either Predicted by the Prophets, or Recorded by the Evangeliſts, which does not come within the Verge of this comprehenſive Appellation. Well therefore might St *Matthew*, who was acquainted with the *Eaſtern* Idiom, and underſtood the Word in it's Full Import and Extent, declare it to be Foretold by *the Prophets*, That he ſhould be *called*, or rather, as the Verb often ſignifies, *be*, A NAZARENE.

AND as our Lord was ſtiled Ναζωραιος from other Inſtances of his Humiliation, and Paſſion; ſo in a particular manner from his having been Educated at *Nazareth*. Indeed, it was the *Name* of this Town, and the *Reproachful Uſage* our Saviour met with on account of his having reſided there, which gave Occaſion to the Citation before us. *Nazareth* was infamous, to a Proverb, for the mean Character and low Fortune of it's Inhabitants. Inſomuch, that barely to have dwelt there, for ſome time, was reckoned a thing ſo baſe and diſreputable, that it not only furniſhed the *Jews* with a Common Topic of Scandal againſt our Saviour; but made a Part of that malicious Accuſation, which was fixed to his Croſs in Letters of *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Hebrew* — *Jeſus of Nazareth*. Nor did this reproachful Appellation ceaſe with our Saviour's Sufferings on the Croſs. *Julian*, in alluſion to the ſame opprobrious Epithet, calls him the *Galilean*; and it is well known, that the uſual Name *We Chriſtians* go by amongſt our Enemies, the Jews and Mahometans, is that of *Nazarenes*.

renes. The Evangeliſt, then, writing the Hiſtory of his *Deſpiſed, Perſecuted* Maſter; and falling upon the mention of his Removal to the Place, which had been one Great Occaſion of his having been thus *Deſpiſed* and *Perſecuted*; and finding moreover an Exact Agreement between the Name *Nazur*, which had been given him (as he *was to be* a *Deſpiſed* and *Perſecuted* Perſon) and Ναζωραος, the Name he had from the Town, which *had been* the Chief Cauſe of his *Reproaches* and *Perſecutions*; could not let ſlip this Opportunity of obſerving, once for all, that *Now* was *fulfilled* what *was ſpoken by the Prophets*, Ναζωραος κληθησεται, *He ſhall be called* &c.

THUS have I endeavoured to explain and vindicate a Paſſage of Holy Scripture, which has been all along looked on as one ſtanding Argument of the Meſſiahſhip of our Bleſſed Saviour; but which has of late Years been repreſented as a Forged or Impertinent Quotation, and inſufficient to bear the Weight laid upon it. I have ſhewn that it is not, as is inſinuated, a Fraudulent *Invention* of the Evangeliſt, but a fair *Prediction* of the Prophets: that it contains a *Known* Character of the *Meſſiah*; a Character, not founded on the *Similitude* of a *Word*, but on the *Reaſon* of the *Thing*; a Character, not taken from a *Dubious* Text of a *Single* Prophet, but collected from the *Whole Body* of the Prophetical Writings.

WHEN therefore hereafter, in the affecting Hiſtory of our Saviour's Paſſion, the Croſs ſhall preſent us with that noted Inſcription, *Jeſus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*; let us not, with *Pilate*, who Crucified the Son of

of God a *Firſt* Time, or with the profane Scoffer, who is Crucifying him a Second; look upon the *Former* of theſe Characters as inconſiſtent with the *Latter*: being fully aſſured, from the Whole Scope and Tenor of the Prophetical Writings, That the Promiſed *Meſſiah* was to be *Jeſus of Nazareth*, a Deſpiſed, Perſecuted, Afflicted Perſon, as well as *King of the Jews*.

END.

PUBLISHED

BY

The ſame Author:

I.

De Antiquitate, Elegantia, Utilitate, LINGUÆ ARABICÆ; ORATIO habita OXONII, in Schola Linguarum, VII Kalend. *Auguſti*, MDCCXXXVIII.

II.

De Uſu DIALECTORUM ORIENTALIUM, ac Præcipue ARABICÆ, in Hebraico Codice Interpretando; ORATIO habita OXONII, in Schola Linguarum, VII Kalend. *Martii*, MDCCXLVIII.